

SEP 6 1961

PERIODICAL  
READING ROOM

*Weeklies*



# Bulletin

JX  
232  
A435  
no. 1157

Vol. XLV, No. 1157

August 28, 1961

- ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS, A PROGRAM FOR THE  
PEOPLES OF THE AMERICAS** • *Message From Presi-  
dent Kennedy and Statement by Secretary of the Treasury  
Douglas Dillon* . . . . . 355
- DEPARTMENT SUPPORTS CONTINUATION OF  
REFUGEE AND MIGRATION PROGRAMS** • *State-  
ment by Deputy Under Secretary Jones* . . . . . 380
- THE VELA PROGRAM, ITS IMPORTANCE IN DE-  
TECTING NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS AND IN  
SECURING AN EFFECTIVE TEST BAN TREATY** •  
*Statement by Ambassador Arthur H. Dean* . . . . . 375
- THE SEARCH FOR BALANCED ECONOMIC AND  
SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT** • *Statement by Ambassador  
Adlai E. Stevenson* . . . . . 363

THE  
OFFICIAL  
WEEKLY RECORD  
OF  
UNITED STATES  
FOREIGN POLICY

*For index see inside back cover*

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

# Bulletin

VOL. XLV, No. 1157 • PUBLICATION 7252

August 28, 1961

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents  
U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:  
52 issues, domestic \$5.50, foreign \$12.25  
Single copy, 25 cents

Use of funds for printing of this publication approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 10, 1961).

**Note:** Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated. The BULLETIN is indexed in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature.

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

## Alliance for Progress, a Program for the Peoples of the Americas

*On August 5 a special meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council convened at Punta del Este, Uruguay. Following is a message from President Kennedy read before the opening session, together with a statement made on August 7 by the chairman of the U.S. delegation, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon.*

### MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT KENNEDY

White House press release (Hyannis, Mass.) dated August 5

Fellow citizens of the Americas: Twenty-five years ago one of the greatest of my predecessors, Franklin Roosevelt, addressed the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, meeting at Buenos Aires—a conference called to protect the peace and freedom of the hemisphere.

That conference was a great success. Its accomplishments were, in Roosevelt's words, "far-reaching and historic." New molds of friendship and cooperation were forged. A new day in the history of the Americas had begun.

Yet, on his return from the conference, President Roosevelt stopped in Montevideo just a few miles from your meeting place to warn that "We have not completed our task. . . . That task is a continuing one. We seek new remedies for new conditions; new conditions will continue to arise. . . . But the net result is that we move forward."

Today, a quarter century later, we meet to carry on that task to demonstrate anew that freedom is not merely a word or an abstract theory but the most effective instrument for advancing the welfare of man. We face new conditions and we must devise new remedies to meet them, and we are confident that we will move forward.

Those of you at this conference are present at an historic moment in the life of this hemisphere. For this is far more than an economic discussion

or a technical conference on development. In a very real sense it is a demonstration of the capacity of free nations to meet the human and material problems of the modern world. It is a test of the values of our own society, a proving ground for the vitality of freedom in the affairs of man.

The views of the United States on the important social and economic questions encompassed by the agenda will be fully explained by Secretary C. Douglas Dillon. Underlying those views are the simple and basic principles of the Alliance for Progress.

We live in a hemisphere whose own revolution has given birth to the most powerful forces of the modern age—the search for the freedom and self-fulfillment of man. We meet to carry on that revolution to shape the future as we have the past.

This means that all of our countries—nations of the north and nations of the south—must make new efforts of unparalleled magnitude.

Self-fulfillment for the developing nations means careful national planning, the orderly establishment of goals, priorities, and long-range programs.

It means expanded export markets, closer economic integration within Latin America, and greater market stability for the major primary products.

It means the dedication of a greatly increased proportion of national resources and capital to the cause of development.

And it means full recognition of the right of all the people to share fully in our progress. For there is no place in democratic life for institutions which benefit the few while denying the needs of the many even though the elimination of such institutions may require far-reaching and difficult changes such as land reform and tax reform and a vastly increased emphasis on education and

health and housing. Without these changes our common effort cannot succeed.

The Alliance for Progress also means a greatly increased effort by the United States both in terms of material resources and deeper comprehension of the basic needs of Latin America. My country has already begun its contribution. During the year which began on March 13 with the announcement of the Alliance for Progress<sup>1</sup> the United States will allocate more than \$1 billion in development assistance to Latin America. This amount is more than three times that made available last year. It includes less than half of the \$500 million appropriated under the Act of Bogotá.<sup>2</sup> It does not include the additional resources which will be made available through the World Bank, other international institutions, and private sources.

This rapid increase in the level of our assistance is only the first step in our continuing and expanding effort to help build a better life for the people of the hemisphere, an effort to which I am devoting my personal attention. And as the nations of Latin America take the necessary steps, as they formulate the plans, mobilize the internal resources, make the difficult and necessary social reforms, and accept the sacrifice necessary if their national energy is to be fully directed to economic development—then I believe that the United States should supplement this effort by helping to provide resources of a scope and magnitude adequate to realize the bold and elevated goals envisaged by the Alliance for Progress. For, as I have said before, only an effort of towering dimension—an effort similar to that which was needed to rebuild the economies of Western Europe—can insure fulfillment of our Alliance for Progress.

This heroic effort is not for governments alone. Its success demands the participation of all our people—of workers and farmers, businessmen and intellectuals, and, above all, of the young people of the Americas. For to them and to their children belongs the new world we are resolved to create.

The tasks before us are vast, the problems diffi-

<sup>1</sup> For an address by President Kennedy on Mar. 13 and a message sent to Congress on Mar. 14, see BULLETIN of Apr. 3, 1961, pp. 471 and 474.

<sup>2</sup> For text of the Act of Bogotá, see *ibid.*, Oct. 3, 1960, p. 537; for a statement by Under Secretary Ball on Apr. 28, 1961, see *ibid.*, June 5, 1961, p. 864.

cult, the challenges unparalleled. But we carry with us the vision of a new and better world and the unlimited power of free men guided by free governments. And I believe that our ultimate success will make us proud to have lived and worked at this historic moment in the life of our hemisphere.

#### STATEMENT BY SECRETARY DILLON

Press release 555 dated August 7

It was a great American—José Martí—who reminded us that “We Americans are one in origin, in hope and in danger.” We meet today in fulfillment of that concept—brought together by our common origin, fired by our common hopes, determined to conquer our common dangers.

We assemble here at Punta del Este to chart the future course of our hemisphere. Upon our deliberations and decisions rest the hopes of Americans yet to come. What we are able to accomplish here may well determine whether the most cherished values of our civilization—the freedom and the dignity of man—are to be strengthened and expanded.

This is a revolutionary task. But we are no strangers to revolution. From the shores of the Americas almost 200 years ago went forth the call to freedom and national independence which today guides men's actions in all the turbulent continents of the world.

It was our hemisphere which first proved that men could rule themselves, that colonial shackles could be cast off, and that governments could be the instruments of man's liberty.

This was the spirit of our revolution and of the revolutions it has inspired. It is the spirit which has shaped our hemisphere. It is the spirit of our continuing struggle against the despotism which is as ancient as the Pharaohs, no matter what new form it may assume; and it is that spirit—the legacy of Artigas and San Martín, of Bolívar and Washington, of O'Higgins and José Bonifacio—which guides our actions here today.

But the fruits of the American revolution have not yet been extended to all our people. Throughout the hemisphere millions still live with hunger, poverty, and despair. They have been denied access to the benefits of modern knowledge and technology. And they now demand those benefits for themselves and for their children.

We cannot rest content until these just demands



are met. And it is our profound conviction that they can be met only by free men working within a framework of free institutions.

That is what the Alliance for Progress is about. It is a bold and massive effort to bring meaning and dignity into the lives of all our people to demonstrate to the world that freedom and progress walk hand in hand.

To accomplish this we must dedicate ourselves to the proposition that the decade of the sixties will be a decade of democratic progress—a period which will witness great forward strides in the development of Latin America, a period in which all our nations will greatly advance the standard of living of their peoples.

#### **Underlying Basic Principles**

Underlying the effort we must make are certain basic principles:

First, no developing nation can progress unless it makes heroic efforts to summon its people to the task of development, unless it dedicates a larger proportion of domestic resources to the common effort, and unless it calls upon all groups in the society to make fresh and larger contributions to the cause of national progress.

Second, developing countries need national programs of economic and social development—programs which set forth goals and priorities and insure that available resources are used in the most effective manner. Long-term development plans can greatly speed the process of growth.

Third, national development programs must recognize the right of all the people to share fully in the fruits of progress. For there is no place in our democratic life for institutions which benefit the few while denying the needs of the many.

We welcome the revolution of rising expectations among our peoples; and we intend to transform it into a revolution of rising satisfactions.

To carry out these principles will often require difficult and far-reaching changes. It will require a strengthening of tax systems so that would-be evaders will know they face strict penalties and so that taxes are assessed in accordance with ability to pay. It will require land reform so that underutilized soil is put to full use and so that farmers can own their own land. It will require lower interest rates on loans to small farmers and small business. It will require greatly increased programs of education, housing, and health. And

for the United States it will require a clear acceptance of further responsibilities to aid our sister Republics.

- We can press forward with industrialization to help modernize our economics and provide employment for our rapidly growing urban populations.

- We can establish a society in which no man wants for food and all have access to education.

- We can clear away city slums and wipe out disease by making full use of the wonders of modern medicine.

- We can eliminate the poverty which burdens our farmers and make it possible for every man to own the land he works.

- We can do away with the social and economic injustice which undermines free political institutions.

All this and more is within our power if we dedicate the creative energies of free men to the cause of progress. This is what President Kennedy meant by his call for an Alliance for Progress.

#### **Charting a Course for the Sixties**

Mr. Chairman, here at Punta del Este there lies before us the opportunity to create a solid framework of inter-American cooperation to carry forward the Alliance for Progress. To build that framework we must, here and now, chart the course we are determined to follow in the decade of the sixties.

- Let us establish the economic and social goals we shall pursue in the next 10 years.

- Let us determine to prepare, as rapidly as possible, comprehensive, long-term national development programs, meanwhile going ahead at full speed with urgent development projects and measures that are ready for consideration.

- Let us greatly strengthen our inter-American machinery for economic and social progress, harnessing our best talents in the service of development.

- Let us concert our policies to expand world markets for our exports and to bring greater stability to our foreign exchange earnings.

- Let us move ahead with economic integration in Latin America, releasing the powerful stimulus which this movement can give to the development process.

• Let us also build a great common market of intellectual, cultural, and scientific interchange. For this will forge indissoluble ties among our peoples to their mutual enrichment.

My delegation is prepared to discuss in detail these essentials of the Alliance for Progress. Meanwhile I wish to make certain observations on some of the more important of them.

#### **Essentials of Alliance for Progress**

It has been suggested by the group of experts that a major goal of national development programming should be the achievement of a substantial and sustained increase in per capita growth rates, the target for any Latin American country to be set at not less than 2½ percent per year, which means an average overall growth rate of better than 5 percent.

My Government is in agreement with this concept. Moreover, we believe that this goal is attainable. Growth rates have not been adequate in the past; we can and must do better. But this requires the will to devote adequate internal resources to development and to do so wisely in accordance with well-conceived plans and programs. If this is done the vital supplement of external resources will be available.

In his message to this conference on Saturday President Kennedy pledged the full support of the United States and pointed out that public assistance from the United States to Latin America has already been increased to an annual rate of more than \$1 billion—three times last year's amount.

This is a measure of our continuing devotion to the concepts of the Alliance for Progress. Furthermore, it is our intention that future development loans made by our new aid agency will be on a long-term basis, running where appropriate up to 50 years. We also intend to make the bulk of these loans at very low or zero rates of interest.

Looking to the years ahead, and to all sources of external financing—from international institutions, from Europe and Japan as well as from North America, from new private investment as well as from public funds—Latin America, if it takes the necessary internal measures, can reasonably expect its own efforts to be matched by an inflow of capital during the next decade amounting to at least \$20 billion. And most of this will come from public sources. The problem, I am

convinced, will no longer lie in shortages of external capital but in organizing effective development programs so that both domestic and foreign capital can be put to work rapidly, wisely, and well.

In these programs education must receive a high priority. Our goal must be to insure that a decade from now every Latin American youngster who reaches the age of 12 is able to read, write, and do simple arithmetic. These tools will give him access to the great storehouse of human knowledge and will open the road to self-improvement.

It therefore behooves all nations in the hemisphere—even, and perhaps especially, the poorest—to enlarge the share of national income devoted to education.

Along with greater financial support, our educational institutions require far-reaching reforms—and I include those of my own country. Curriculums must be brought up to date, and techniques of teaching and learning must likewise be modernized. A task force on education should be created immediately. Such a task force can be the needed catalyst to rapid progress on the education front. It can clarify the educational needs of each country, including manpower requirements. It can establish priorities for meeting these needs.

In addition to education our agenda, in item I (E), looks toward the formulation of detailed policies and recommendations in a number of other specialized fields, including investment programming, industrialization, agricultural improvement, and public health. I hope that this conference will call upon the Secretary General of the OAS [Organization of American States] to promptly establish task forces to consider these problems.

I believe it is especially urgent to set up a task force on land reform. Such a task force could recommend the measures required to bring about the great increase in agricultural productivity which we must have, while at the same time assuring that the benefits of this productivity are available to all who work the land. This may often mean not only the settlement of public lands but also the redistribution of underused latifundia. It will also mean a whole host of new techniques, including expanded credit facilities, the promotion of cooperatives, and provision of effective extension services.

The United States is prepared to finance inter-American task forces in these various fields to elaborate the specific and concerted actions which countries need to consider in drawing up their programs.

In the vitally important fields of tax administration and tax structure, two conferences have already been arranged for this fall and next spring under the auspices of the OAS and ECLA [U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America]. We believe that this meeting should endorse the purposes of these conferences. Their results could prove to be of enormous help in mobilizing the resources required for economic and social progress.

Low-cost housing is another vital ingredient of the Alliance for Progress. We congratulate the Inter-American Development Bank for its prompt action in utilizing funds from the social progress trust fund to finance housing projects in Panama and Venezuela, as well as for the loan just announced to help small farmers in El Salvador. The United States believes that an immediate and large-scale program—perhaps as much as \$100 million—for aided self-help housing would be a wise investment of the funds provided to the IDB by the United States under the social progress trust agreement.

Enlarged expenditures for economic and social progress call for the reduction of needless or luxurious expenditures for other purposes. It is time we brought these considerations to bear on military expenditures in considering the competing demands of development and inter-American defense. As ministers of finance or economy we need to encourage those responsible for our common defense to engage in the critical review required to avoid imbalances between military and other expenditures. The Inter-American Defense Board can give invaluable assistance in identifying essential requirements for defense against both direct and indirect aggression.

#### **Cooperation in Development and Economic Matters**

One important element in the proposed new structure of inter-American cooperation is the Committee on Development Plans first suggested by the expert group on topic I of our agenda. A special committee of highly qualified and experienced experts could review national development

programs in close consultation with the governments concerned and provide independent evaluations which would be helpful in enlisting the support of other governments and international institutions.

Such a committee would not interfere with the responsibility of each national government to formulate its own targets, priorities, and measures for national development. But it would be an instrument of great value in facilitating the systematic and sustained provision of outside assistance for soundly conceived progress. The details of its membership—staffing, location, relations with the Inter-American Development Bank, and other such matters—are all matters for our working committees to settle.

If a body of highly qualified and impartial experts is established, my own Government would expect its recommendations to be of great importance in determining the allocation of our own resources to Latin America for development purposes. We would also expect other friendly governments which are potential suppliers of capital, together with the international institutions in which we participate, to accept these expert recommendations as a major factor in their decisions on aid for Latin America.

Continued and steady economic growth demands a solid basis in expanding trade. The development of measures to stabilize, strengthen, and enlarge the markets for Latin American exports must therefore be an integral part of the Alliance for Progress. The United States is ready to cooperate in seeking workable solutions for commodity problems and to give its support to the activities of the various international bodies in this field.

The most urgent and important commodity problem confronting the countries of Latin America is that of coffee. A solution to this problem must be found. The current coffee situation results in a needless drain on resources and is a threat to the economic well-being and stability of 14 nations of the hemisphere.

The weakness of the existing coffee agreement is twofold: Its membership has been limited to exporters only, and it has not been possible to make its export quotas fully effective.

We believe that an entirely new agreement is needed. For if export earnings of the coffee-producing countries are to be safeguarded, quotas

must be geared to actual consumption and must be enforceable. The United States is prepared to join a workable coffee agreement, to use its good offices to urge the participation of other consuming countries, and to help in the enforcement of export quotas through the use of import controls. We all know that any lasting stabilization of prices will also require courageous programs to deal effectively with overproduction.

When the coffee study group meets in September, the United States will propose that a new agreement be drafted to achieve these ends.

Tin is another commodity of importance to this hemisphere. In order to strengthen and support the international tin agreement we plan to discuss with the Tin Council, at an early date, the terms of possible United States accession to the agreement.

We also believe that the proposal in the report of the group of experts for an export-receipts stabilization fund is worthy of careful study. It offers promising possibilities even though there are many technical and policy issues regarding the scope, functions, and financing of the suggested fund which must be carefully weighed. In the third committee my delegation will propose the appointment of a task force to meet promptly after this conference to explore the plan in detail and make appropriate recommendations.

#### **Economic Integration of Latin America**

I turn now to the economic integration of Latin America. Four countries of Central America have agreed upon a full customs union with internal free trade for substantially all their production. Their bold and decisive action commands our admiration. We are confident that it will open the way to their accelerated development.

The ratification of the Montevideo Treaty establishing the Latin American Free Trade Association is another significant milestone along the road to a Latin American common market. It is our hope that its members will find it possible to expand rapidly the list of products which are to be traded freely so that the full benefits of integration can be realized.

The United States is deeply conscious of the concern in many Latin American countries for the future of their export markets in the European Economic Community. That Community has

committed itself to a liberal commercial policy. All of us in the Western Hemisphere have the right to expect that this commitment will be honored. In addition to protecting our own commercial interests, the United States will continue to urge upon the Community the importance of fair treatment for exports of special interest to Latin America and other developing areas. I think this conference should know that in recent weeks the United States has proposed to the Community the adoption of a program to eliminate the tariff preferences on tropical products now accorded the associated overseas territories. Furthermore, we have informed the Community that we are prepared to give financial support to such a program. We will continue to press this proposal.

Mr. President, we are met here at an eastern outpost of a great and rich continent. Across that continent live millions of people struggling to break the bonds which chain them to lives of endless toil, of disease and hunger and hopeless poverty. We are here to help them break those bonds—to build the foundations on which will rise a new hemisphere, a hemisphere where human freedom flourishes in lands of hope and progress.

We approach this task with full knowledge of its vast dimensions—of the enormity of the struggle which lies ahead. But we also approach it with sure confidence in the unconquerable powers of free men and with faith in the God who has guided us so surely through the dangers of the past. Working together—with His help—I am confident we will succeed.

#### **President Quadros of Brazil To Visit United States**

White House press release dated August 8

The White House announced on August 8 that President Janio da Silva Quadros of Brazil has accepted an invitation from President Kennedy to make a state visit to the United States, to begin December 5, 1961.

As is customary on such occasions, President Quadros will spend the first 3 days in Washington, where he will meet with President Kennedy, Secretary of State Rusk, and other high officials of the U.S. Government. President Quadros will spend the remainder of his visit traveling to other parts of the United States.



## Secretary Holds European Talks on Current World Problems

On August 3 Secretary Rusk met with President Kennedy prior to his departure for Paris for consultations with the Foreign Ministers of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the United Kingdom. On August 8, at the close of the four-power talks, Mr. Rusk met with the Permanent Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He then conferred with Italian Prime Minister Amintore Fanfani and Foreign Minister Antonio Segni at Rome on August 9, and with the German Chancellor, Konrad Adenauer, on August 10 at the Villa Cadenabbia on Lake Como, Italy. Following are remarks made by Secretary Rusk after his meeting with President Kennedy, together with a NATO communique released on August 8.

### REMARKS BY SECRETARY RUSK

White House press release dated August 3

I have just had a talk with the President before leaving this evening for a few days on the other side of the Atlantic. I will be talking this weekend with the Foreign Ministers of our allies who are directly involved in the problem of Germany and Berlin. And then I shall be meeting with the North Atlantic Council to talk with them on the same subject at their headquarters in Paris. After that I shall be meeting with the American Ambassadors in European capitals, in order to get the benefit of their views and to bring them up to date on our present approach to the German and Berlin question.

President Kennedy has already told our own people—and indeed the people of the rest of the world—how we see this Berlin problem.<sup>1</sup> It is essentially a very simple problem. There is peace in Berlin, and there is no need to disturb it. There is freedom in West Berlin, and we cannot allow that freedom to be undermined or destroyed.

Now there are some who think that it is negative or old-fashioned to be in favor of the *status quo*. Now we ourselves and the West would like to see an improvement in the *status quo*. And since 1946 the West has made many suggestions

for changing the situation in Germany so that we can have permanent peace and a permanent settlement in that country. But we cannot admit to a change in the *status quo* at the cost of peace and freedom in central Europe.

I have no doubt whatever that our NATO alliance—that the great Atlantic Community—will meet this problem with unity and firmness and determination, but also with reasonableness and a readiness to discuss, which characterizes this great, experienced Western community of nations.

There is no reason why this problem cannot be solved by peaceful means if those others beyond the Iron Curtain are willing to approach it in the same spirit. President Kennedy has indicated to the entire world this combination of firmness and readiness to discuss, which must be characteristic of a responsible, great nation.

This is no time for recklessness—recklessness in word or in deeds. But may I point out that one can be reckless in two directions, in giving away essential positions, which only postpone the day of tragedy to some future date, or a recklessness of rash action not thoughtfully pursued; and I am quite sure that the Western alliance will be reckless in neither one of these directions.

Thank you very much.

### NATO COMMUNIQUE

The Ministers noted with regret the lack of progress on the reunification of Germany. They reaffirmed their conviction that a peaceful and just solution for the problem of Germany including Berlin is to be found only on the basis of self-determination. With particular regard to Berlin, they reiterated their determination, as expressed in the declaration of 16th December, 1958,<sup>2</sup> to maintain the freedom of West Berlin and its people. As to the often repeated threat by the Soviet Union to sign a separate peace treaty, they reaffirmed the statement in the 1958 declaration that "the denunciation by the Soviet Union of the inter-allied agreement on Berlin can in no way deprive the other parties of their rights or relieve the Soviet Union of its obligations".

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Aug. 14, 1961, p. 287.

<sup>2</sup> For text, see *ibid.*, Jan. 5, 1959, p. 4.



## **Travel Restrictions in Berlin Called Contravention of Agreement**

*Statement by Secretary Rusk*

Press release 563 dated August 13

The authorities in East Berlin and East Germany have taken severe measures to deny to their own people access to West Berlin. These measures have doubtless been prompted by the increased flow of refugees in recent weeks. The refugees are not responding to persuasion or propaganda from the West but to the failures of communism in East Germany. These failures have created great pressures upon Communist leaders, who, in turn, are trying to solve their own problems by the dangerous course of threats against the freedom and safety of West Berlin. The resulting tension has itself stimulated flights from the East.

Having denied the collective right of self-determination to the peoples of East Germany, Communist authorities are now denying the right of individuals to elect a world of free choice rather than a world of coercion. The pretense that communism desires only peaceful competition is exposed; the refugees, more than half of whom are less than 25 years of age, have "voted with their feet" on whether communism is the wave of the future.

Available information indicates that measures taken thus far are aimed at residents of East Berlin and East Germany and not at the Allied position in West Berlin or access thereto. However, limitation on travel within Berlin is a violation of the four-power status of Berlin and a flagrant violation of the right of free circulation throughout the city. Restrictions on travel between East Germany and Berlin are in direct contravention of the four-power agreement reached at Paris on June 20, 1949.<sup>1</sup> These violations of existing agreements will be the subject of vigorous protest through appropriate channels.

## **Letters of Credence**

### *Nepal*

The newly appointed Ambassador of Nepal, Matrika Prasad Koirala, presented his credentials

to President Kennedy on August 3. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 549 dated August 3.

## **U.S. Welcomes Prospect of Entry of Great Britain Into Common Market**

*Statement by President Kennedy<sup>1</sup>*

I read last week with great interest the statement by Prime Minister Macmillan calling for negotiations looking toward Great Britain's entry as a full member in the European Common Market. I am gratified that this statement has been well received by the governments that are already members of the Common Market and by the Commission of the European Economic Community. The United States Government, under the leadership of both parties, has steadfastly supported the political and economic integration of Western Europe. We are convinced that the continuing progress of this movement can bring new vitality to the Atlantic Community and mounting strength to the free world. We welcome the prospect of Britain's participation in the institutions of the Treaty of Rome and in the economic growth that is the achievement and promise of the Common Market.

During the progress of the negotiations the United States will of course give close attention to the developments affecting our own economic interest and those of other friendly states in this hemisphere and elsewhere.

The enlargement of the European Community will necessarily result in some changes in the pattern of trade, but the necessary adjustments can be greatly facilitated if the European Community builds on the principles of broad and increasing trade relations with all other nations. It is our hope that progress toward this end is being made during the tariff negotiations under way in Geneva, in which both the European Economic Community and the United Kingdom are participating.

<sup>1</sup> Read by the President at a news conference on Aug. 10.

<sup>1</sup> For text, see BULLETIN of July 4, 1949, p. 857.

## The Search for Balanced Economic and Social Development

*Statement by Adlai E. Stevenson  
U.S. Representative to the United Nations*<sup>1</sup>

I am most grateful for this opportunity to participate in the work of the Economic and Social Council and to exchange ideas with so many distinguished representatives from all parts of the world. Since its creation at San Francisco, I, like many others, have felt that this Council works in the area which holds out the greatest hope of realizing man's dearest dream—peace with justice and freedom.

First, let me express what I am sure you all feel—our gratitude to the Secretary-General for his excellent and comprehensive reviewing of the world economic situation; and I am glad that he emphasized our difficulties rather than our achievements.

There are plenty of both, and to expose our difficulties with ruthless candor is not to "belittle" our achievements, as Mr. Harriman [W. Averell Harriman, U.S. Ambassador at Large] has said. Moreover, our difficulties are urgent and insistent, and our attack on them will be none too soon. "Time," as the Secretary-General says, "is not necessarily on our side."

I have recently returned from a journey to all the capitals of South America<sup>2</sup>—my second in the past 2 years. And I came back even more convinced that social reforms—in land tenure, taxation, housing, health, and wealth distribution—are the only solid foundation for economic progress; and that, in turn, a better standard of living for the masses, or at least the hope therefor, is the

only assurance of political stability in a continent enjoying democratic governments almost everywhere—for the first time.

It is for that reason that the social advances contemplated by the Act of Bogotá<sup>3</sup> last year and by President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress program<sup>4</sup> this year have raised such hopes in Latin America that a new day is dawning.

I believe it is—and it will be in no small measure due to the technical assistance and Special Fund activities of the United Nations and to the planning and precepts of Dr. Raúl Prebisch and the Economic Commission for Latin America. And if I single out this regional commission for applause it is only because I am more familiar with its work than that of the other commissions of this Council.

In the United Nations I have been mostly concerned with political and security matters. And I would be the last to discount the importance of incessant, patient, and tireless search in this nuclear age for solutions, or at least a *modus vivendi*, in the many complex and dangerous situations which man seems to create so easily and solve with such difficulty. Fires must be put out. Diseases must be cured. But building is much more satisfying and constructive than putting out fires. And this is essentially the task of this body—the Economic and Social Council.

But economics must always be the servant of society. No amount of steel or cement produced, of oil wells drilled, or acres of wheat harvested, is of any consequence except as it fills a human need—unless the steel and cement make decent houses and schools and hospitals, unless the oil

<sup>1</sup> Made at the 32d session of the Economic and Social Council at Geneva on July 10 (U.S./U.N. press release 3744).

<sup>2</sup> For Ambassador Stevenson's report to Secretary Rusk on his visit to South America, see BULLETIN of Aug. 21, 1961, p. 311.

<sup>3</sup> For text, see *ibid.*, Oct. 3, 1960, p. 537.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 355.

warms and transports man and his goods, unless the wheat means bread and strength for those who hunger. The most efficient factory cannot justify a city's slums.

And economic growth is of little avail if it serves only a fraction of the people. It must serve them all. And the greatest challenge of our century is the aspiration of peoples all over the globe to share the abundant fruits of modern science and technology. The example of the industrially developed nations shows that human beings can lead longer, healthier, and richer lives than most of the world's population now enjoy and that each generation can have the satisfaction of bequeathing new opportunities to its children.

#### **Imperative of Progress Sweeping World**

The idea of progress, the imperative of progress, has swept the world as never before. The new nations aspire to telescope into decades economic development which took centuries in the advanced countries. At the end of the century we will be judged, all of us, by how well we have met these aspirations. We must bridge the dangerous chasm between the living standards of the rich and the poor. We must narrow the disparities in the conditions of life between human beings who happen to be born on different parts of the earth. We seek greater economic equality between nations as well as within nations—not dividing up our present scarcities but sharing in a growing abundance.

The world economy must grow in capacity to produce—faster in the less developed regions than in the industrially developed countries, but faster than in the past everywhere. For no one anywhere, any longer, will passively accept the idea that hunger, misery, and disease are the immutable destiny of man. For everyone, everywhere, realizes that in this historic century man has routed the four horsemen of the apocalypse, and that for the first time in human history the ancient evil specters of pestilence and famine have been exorcised. We are crossing a great watershed in history to a time when enough food, shelter, clothing are within the reach of all and new dimensions in human wants and needs are emerging.

It will be no help to the developing countries to slow down the growth of the developed countries. Quite the contrary. For the emerging nations need above all an increased flow of resources from the industrial countries. To be able

to provide this aid, and to provide expanding markets for the exports of the less developed economies, the advanced countries will have to progress steadily and rapidly in their capacity to produce. As the Secretary-General put it: "The rate at which industrial countries expand their intake of goods from the less developed countries depends in part on their rate of economic growth."

The United States has, in keeping with its wealth and income, assumed great responsibilities in economic aid. To meet these and other international responsibilities and to better provide for the wants of our own people, the United States must grow in its capacity to produce. We look forward to the 1960's as a decade of dynamic and accelerated economic development, demonstrating to all the vigor and vitality of a free economy. And we pledge to do all in our power to make the sixties a decade of development not only for ourselves but, we hope, for our fellow men everywhere.

The first step along this path has been the reversal of the recession in our domestic economy. As Secretary Hammarskjöld has said, it was "only a gentle one." Production in the United States is expected to rise throughout this year and next as the economy moves toward full employment of labor and full utilization of our industrial capacity. We can take some comfort in the fact that by prewar standards our postwar recessions have been mild in their effects on output and unemployment. The recent recession was also relatively mild in its effect on the value of imports into the United States. In 1960 imports were the second highest in our history—although some 3 percent less than 1959. We have now evolved the institutions, the economic understanding, and the political will to avoid depressions and extensive and prolonged unemployment.

But our periodic postwar recessions, mild though they have been, have cost us dearly in human disappointment and wasted national opportunities. So the first step in our program for growth is to take up the present slack and to mobilize the weight of the Government's influence to prevent or arrest future interruptions in our economic progress. The idea that the rate of economic growth in a free society does not have to be left to chance, that democratic nations can control their economic destinies, has now become our conviction.

What has happened since 1945 has confounded the pessimists. In no other period of the world's

history has there been such a rapid and gratifying recovery from the devastation of war. This recovery has been greatly aided by international cooperation and economic aid. Western Europe and Japan have achieved spectacular results. We recognize that the record of the Soviet Union, too, is impressive. In my country, happily spared the devastation of war and starting from a high level of production and consumption, our national production in real terms has increased by more than one-third since the war's end.

If we look further back over the 20th century, the record of economic and social progress is even more impressive. In the United States per capita income has doubled in the last quarter century. This growth has been achieved not only through very large investments of new capital but by the growth and improvement of technology, the economies of large-scale production as national and international markets have expanded, and the improvement in the quality of the labor force. It has been achieved while at the same time reducing greatly the hours of work in our factories, mines, and farms and providing much more leisure for all of our people.

#### **A Broadened Concept of Social Capital**

It has become clear that what happens in research laboratories and in the minds of men can multiply the potentialities of physical factors.

Hours worked, land utilized, and capital employed are the elements which, by classical formulas, determine the growth of output. But both the quality and quantity of output have been progressively expanding far beyond what the mere physical combination of these factors would indicate. This we must attribute to intelligence, imagination, inventions, entrepreneurship. Brains have become a real growth industry.

The power of intelligence can manifest itself in every aspect of our lives and in every phase of the development process. We need a concept of social capital which goes beyond bricks and mortar and includes investment in education, training, and the stock of useful knowledge.

The United States, like so many other countries, has indeed been making large investments in human cooperation. Our schools and colleges are helping abundantly to increase our physical output. But they are also contributing richly to the quality of life and leisure. Machinery and tech-

nology are far more productive if they are used by educated, skilled, and healthy workers.

I do not underestimate the need for capital formation. It is true that mere investment without new knowledge and new skills could not have generated the growth in output that we have experienced. But it is equally true that knowledge and skills could not have been productive unless they had been linked to real capital. Indeed, without the prospect of new investment, much of the technological progress would never have occurred at all. If we are serious about accelerated economic growth, we must step up the rate of productive investment. President Kennedy has made a number of proposals for economic growth based on the need for all three factors: knowledge, brainpower, more capital.

Policies designed primarily to stimulate economic growth often turn out to have a desirable incidental effect. Education is a good example. The American tradition values education for its own sake; we led the way in the provision of free public education at all levels of society. But we now feel fairly certain that the resulting improvement in the quality of the labor force has been one of the major factors in our economic growth during the last half century.

Before I leave the subject of the United States economy, let me say a word about disarmament and arms control. I am glad the Secretary-General mentioned the large resources available from disarmament. It is no secret that we have been forced to devote a considerable portion of our economy to production for defense. But let me make it perfectly clear that the United States, far from regarding an international armaments agreement as a threat to our economic prosperity, would regard such an agreement as an economic opportunity, an opportunity to free our resources from production of instruments of death to the production of the manifold things we need for a better life, for our own citizens and for the citizens of other nations.

This is not to deny that a sudden change in the direction of production tends to be disruptive. This is true for any economy, however organized. But such disruption can be minimized by foresight. The United States is actively studying the economic impact of disarmament and arms control and is hopefully designing measures to ease the transition. We hope and pray that the day will come when such studies become more than merely



an academic exercise. And I can assure you that the Government of the United States has no higher priority than genuine disarmament and the building of greater confidence and trust among the great powers who have life and death for the human race in their hands.

#### **Development, a Worldwide Effort**

Mr. President, the United States is fixing its own economic sights high for the 1960's. But we do not see our goal as a one-nation project. It is a truism that economic development depends primarily on what is done by the country itself. But truisms are also true, and we can only help others to help themselves. But our world has become so interdependent, so intertwined, that no country can go forward in isolation. The United States was one of the first to recognize that it is in the interest of all mankind to improve the lot of the less privileged nations, even as we discovered a century ago that to improve the lot of the poor was good for the economy as well as the soul.

Consequently, when we think of the sixties as a decade of development, we are thinking in terms of a worldwide effort and a general advance. In working toward this objective the United States has sought to refashion our aid program to meet the needs of this decade.

We also intend to give increased emphasis to multilateral aid programs. During the past year alone our Government has participated in the establishment of the Inter-American Development Bank and the International Development Association. These institutions will provide substantial amounts of development capital on flexible repayment terms. IDA, for example, is already making interest-free loans for up to 50 years.

Our new program will place primary emphasis on bringing as many countries as possible to the point of self-sustaining growth where they no longer need outside assistance. It is not just the goals and the initiatives which will depend primarily on the efforts of the newly developing themselves. The greater part of the resources required must also be generated by their own savings and export earnings. On our side we are prepared to do our utmost to provide that vital margin of help to bridge the gap between their capabilities and their needs.

In connection with this vital issue of the role and sources of savings and investment in relation

to growth, we are fortunate this year to have before us this year's World Economic Survey.<sup>5</sup> There is much in that survey which merits close and careful consideration. And we commend the Secretariat for providing us with this most useful aid to our consideration of the problems of economic development.

In recent months the developed countries of the free world have been discussing prospects for increasing further the flow of economic assistance and capital to the less developed countries. The net flow of public and private aid and capital from developed free-world countries reached the level of almost \$7 billion annually in the years 1956-59, compared with the annual average of \$3.5 billion in the years 1950-55. For the decade of development in the sixties we are setting our sights still higher. With the improved situation in Western Europe and Japan, these nations, I feel confident, have also recognized that the time has come to expand and liberalize their aid to developing countries. I said I had just come from Latin America. Fourteen countries are largely dependent on coffee, and if Germany just reduces its high taxes on coffee, the increased consumption would be worth more than a great deal of aid to Latin America.

A study of development during the fifties makes it clear that private capital has been a most important factor in promoting economic development. Indeed, the country planning economic development without taking into account the great help which foreign private enterprise can provide is like a tennis player who tries to play on one foot. The resources available from private enterprise, both in terms of capital and know-how, are vastly greater than those available to government. With fairness, good will, and good faith on both sides, cooperation between governments and private enterprise, domestic and foreign, can astonish the world with fruitful results for the benefit of people everywhere. We think that government needs the initiative, skill, and experience of private enterprise to meet the expectations of its people.

This brings me to another important facet of American economic development policy: our concern with social justice. We do not have to argue the merits of social justice from the moral standpoint. But the practical economist realizes that it is also essential to any enduring and worthwhile

<sup>5</sup> U.N. doc. E/3501/Rev. 1.



economic development. Neither growth nor political stability can be enduring until all segments of society feel that they have a stake in their country's progress. This is what a distinguished Argentine Minister of Economy had in mind when he used the term "free social economy." We have seen it work in the United States. We know it can work elsewhere.

While the United States cannot make decisions for other countries on measures to foster social justice, we plan to offer inducements to make it attractive for any developing country to undertake internal changes in its own best interest. We are determined that the funds provided by the American taxpayers be used, not to enrich the few, but to improve the lot of the many.

We support wholeheartedly the new and higher joint target of \$150 million annually in contributions to the United Nations Special Fund and Expanded Program of Technical Assistance. We believe that the work of these two programs in the preinvestment field, combined with the provision of capital from the World Bank, IDA, and regional and bilateral sources, can make an increasingly important contribution during the sixties. We shall be glad to study with other countries any and all measures for making their efforts more fruitful.

#### **Trade and Development**

Problems of savings, capital formation, and external aid are vitally important for the economic growth of the underdeveloped countries. But to dwell on these without reference to the major contribution of international trade would be like casting Hamlet without a Prince of Denmark. Trade is the element which binds economies into a closely knitted interdependent world. The progress made toward restoring and expanding a healthy multilateral trade has been one of the most encouraging features of the postwar world. In this very city, at this very time, many nations of the world are now meeting in an intensive effort to find positive means for helping trade to progress toward its fullest potentials.

The growth of trade is indispensable to many of the underdeveloped economies which depend so heavily on exports for the materials and equipment so essential for their development. It is hardly original to say that what happens to commodity prices is a powerful influence for good

or bad in raw-material producing countries, which most of the less developed nations are.

Much effort is currently being directed in the forums of the United Nations and elsewhere to exploring means for dealing with the varied and complex commodity problems which affect the welfare of underdeveloped countries. The possible role of commodity agreements and compensatory financing are receiving particularly close consideration. It is clear, however, that arrangements directed solely to the problem of price instability would not suffice to deal with a major aspect of the current commodity situation. The fact is that oversupply and overcapacity are the most pressing problems now affecting current commodity markets. This is the single most important cause for the persistent downward pressure upon world commodity prices which has prevented these prices from responding fully to improvement in demand.

Obviously what is required above all else in tackling commodity stabilization problems is cooperation between producing and consuming countries. And I want to renew the assurance given by President Kennedy that the United States is prepared to give its wholehearted cooperation in such endeavors.

I should like to mention one particular type of commodity—food. As you know, Mr. President, my country has been blessed with an abundance of food. Over and above what we have marketed through normal commercial channels, we have since 1954 provided over \$9 billion worth of agricultural commodities to countries in need on very favorable terms. At the same time we have tried to be scrupulously careful to avoid injury to other exporters of primary commodities. We have tried to insure that use of our agricultural surplus brought about increased consumption which would not have taken place under normal market conditions—in short, that people were fed who would otherwise have gone hungry.

Last fall the United States put forward a resolution on the utilization of food surpluses through the United Nations system.\* The Director General of the Food and Agriculture Organization has referred to this initiative as beginning a new chapter in the history of human relations. As a result the Council will consider under another item

---

\* For background and text of resolution, see *BULLETIN* of Nov. 21, 1960, p. 793.

of its agenda the report of the Director General of FAO.<sup>7</sup> I shall, therefore, not deal in detail with the opportunities for international co-operation so brilliantly outlined in that report.

#### Using Aid To Benefit All People

Here, then, are some of our ideas about the tasks the Economic and Social Council faces in the 1960's. They are by no means original, for we have benefited by the ideas and experiences of other nations. We, in turn, hope that our experience in the United States may contribute to the development of societies which have their own traditions, political concepts, and economic goals.

The United States has no ambition to determine the future of the rest of the world. With the liberation of colonial peoples dozens of new nations claim a voice in the affairs of the world community through their participation in the United Nations and its various agencies. We welcome their emergence on the world scene. We look forward to working with them to maintain and strengthen a world order which no great power can dominate.

As one crisis after another explodes around the globe we may at times feel discouraged. Yet tyrannical systems have not succeeded in those areas of the world where workable alternatives exist, however different these alternatives may be from what we in the United States call capitalism or private enterprise. But the crucial necessity is that aid shall be used effectively by governments willing to make economic and social reforms, so that it will benefit not only a few but the people as a whole. It is necessary, therefore, that our economic efforts and our efforts in the social field should be united in a single grand design for human progress. As I said when I returned last month from South America, "... old molds have to be broken and that society which does not translate economic progress into social progress is doomed."<sup>8</sup>

I shall go further and say that plans for economic development that do not from the very outset take into account social needs must fail to achieve both their economic and human goals.

What good are impressive production figures if the vast majority of a country's population remains ill-clad, ill-housed, ill-fed, sick, and illiterate?

In a democratic society—in any good society—the only purpose of economic improvement is to provide a better life for all of the people. If our industrial development creates as many problems as it solves, are we improving the lot of the people? If, because of resistance to land reform, the fruits of improved agricultural methods fall into the pockets of a handful of landowners, rather than into the empty baskets of the people themselves, why should the United Nations, the FAO, and other organizations pour time and money into this so-called "improvement"?

Many countries have learned the wasteful folly of industrial development without social planning. In those satellite shanty towns which surround and deface so many proud cities, all the social evils which economic progress professes to cure, breed and multiply. With no jobs, inadequate shelter, unsanitary living conditions, scanty food, and no schools or recreational opportunities, the standard of living and health goes down instead of up. The restraints of family, tribe, and village are broken, giving way to the havoc of juvenile delinquency and crime.

Likewise, improved agricultural efficiency without social reform often has similar results. Men and women, pushed off the land by machinery, drift into squalid urban centers, and with no provision to receive these newcomers and help them with their staggering new problems, the same old vicious circle is set in motion.

Then there are the stagnant, *status quo* societies where ambition seems buried under centuries of custom and inertia. Here the problems of the *old* shanty towns may be harder to deal with than the *new*. They are so much a part of the landscape that they are forgotten—taken for granted. Who cares about the subhuman dwellers who have lived there since the beginning of time? Is it worth trying to improve their lot if the people themselves don't apparently care?

I say it is not only worth it—it is imperative. A number of years ago the world trend was described in the world situation as "the revolution of rising expectations." Since then the revolution has accelerated beyond anyone's dreams. Its nature, however, hasn't changed—only intensified.

But it isn't factories and roads and dams, in themselves, that people want. These are vastly important, both as symbols and as means to an end. What they really want are homes, food, jobs,

<sup>7</sup> U.N. doc. E/3462.

<sup>8</sup> BULLETIN of July 10, 1961, p. 61.

decent clothes, an education for their children, a chance at life lived in freedom and dignity.

Land reform, urban development, community development, low-cost housing, education, nutrition, sanitation, hygiene, recreation, social welfare—these are the matters that we should be concerned with if we want our economic revolution to succeed.

For if people have a stake in what they are doing they will work for it. And many social programs underpin or contribute to economic goals as well—some, such as education or housing, in a direct fashion, others, such as nutrition and sanitation, resulting in improved health indirectly. Insofar as all of these social programs lift the level of living of the people they improve the chances for sustained economic progress.

So let us not just give lipservice to “balanced economic and social development,” as we call it. Let us remember that the only point of economic development is social development—or, quite simply, a better life for people.

And remember, too, that it is a better life that people all over the world are demanding today with rising insistence. Each year, in millions and tens of millions, with colossal new-found energy, they are marching on to the stage of history; and that is their demand—a better life! No one can march these great hosts of humanity off the stage again. But it is within our power to help determine their future, whether in their frustration they will embrace fanaticism and violence or whether they will be enabled to move in peace toward that better life which this age has brought within the vision of all.

We know that no final solutions should ever be expected in human affairs. We do not preach a counsel of perfection. There will be no point in history at which we shall be able to say that all crises have come to an end and that we can live peacefully ever after. But all of us can learn to live calmly and constructively with continuing world crises if we persist in the search, to which this Council is dedicated, for new and more effective means of improving the welfare of human beings.

Mr. President, we have just crossed the threshold of a new decade. Let us so chart our course that this decade may be remembered, not as a period

of power struggle, but as the decade of great triumphs in the age-old struggle to provide a better life for men everywhere.

## **U.S. Asks Approval for Construction of Certain Works in Niagara River**

Press release 557 dated August 8

The Department of State announced on August 8 that on August 1, 1961, it transmitted to the United States Section of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, an application from the Power Authority of the State of New York for approval of the construction of certain works in the Niagara River upstream from Niagara Falls. The approval of the Commission is being sought pursuant to article III of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. The Commission was established by the treaty of 1909 to provide for the settlement of questions and to make recommendations concerning the use of boundary waters between the United States and Canada.

An application similar to that of the Power Authority from the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario was transmitted by the Canadian Department of External Affairs to the Canadian Section of the Commission.

The construction of the works for which the power entities seek approval was recommended by the Commission in an interim report to the Governments dated June 23, 1961, pursuant to a supplementary Niagara Reference to the Commission by the Governments on May 5, 1961. In its interim report the Commission stated that its International Niagara Board of Control had concluded that the construction of the works would permit the full use for power purposes during all seasons of the waters made available for this purpose under the Niagara Treaty of 1950.<sup>1</sup> The Board had also expressed the view that such works would have no significant effect on the scenic beauty of Niagara if they were designed and constructed as indicated in its report. In their application the power entities propose that no feature of construction be undertaken until the final plans, design analysis, and schedule of construction have been approved by the Board on behalf of the International Joint Commission.

<sup>1</sup> Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2130.

OFFICERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, HO  
WITH FUNCTIONAL DESIGNATIONS, DE

[illegible]



Year	Constant Dollars for Nationalization	Constant Dollars for Investment
1953	13-4	13-4
1954	14-5	14-5
1955-61	15-6	15-6

Year	Constant Dollars for Nationalization	Constant Dollars for Investment
1953	13-4	13-4
1954	14-5	14-5
1955-61	15-6	15-6



## Vice President of China Visits United States

White House press release dated August 2

*Following is a joint communique issued by President Kennedy and Vice President Chen Cheng of the Republic of China following discussions held at Washington July 31-August 2.<sup>1</sup>*

President Kennedy and Vice President Chen have concluded a series of cordial and constructive talks on a broad range of international problems and matters of common interest to the Governments and peoples of the United States and the Republic of China. Foreign Minister Shen [Chang-huan], Secretary Rusk, Ambassador [George K. C.] Yeh, Ambassador [Everett F.] Drumright, and other Chinese and U.S. officials participated in the conversations, which were characterized by a spirit of understanding and mutual interest consonant with the deep and lasting friendship between the two countries.

The President, who at his personal initiative had invited the Vice President to the United States for these discussions, welcomed this opportunity to reaffirm the close ties between the Governments and peoples of the United States and the Republic of China.

In their review of the world situation, the President and the Vice President agreed that while Berlin is the current focus of world attention, this problem can be evaluated only against the background of the world-wide Communist challenge. They agreed that although the free world has made serious efforts to relax world tensions, the belligerency of the communist bloc has thus far rendered these efforts fruitless. They further agreed that free world interests require the continued presence of free world forces in West Berlin and the maintenance of the security and the viability of West Berlin.

The President and the Vice President discussed at length the present situation in Asia and expressed their concern over the future of Laos. The President stated that while he is hopeful that the Geneva Conference on Laos will result in the emergence of a truly neutral and independent

<sup>1</sup> Vice President Chen left Washington on Aug. 3 for a trip which included stops at New York City, Knoxville, Tenn., Chicago, Detroit, and San Francisco. He left San Francisco for Taipei on Aug. 10.

## Postage Stamp To Commemorate Anniversary of Chinese Revolution

The White House announced on August 2 that President Kennedy has informed Vice President Chen Cheng of the Republic of China that the United States Government will issue this year a postage stamp commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Chinese revolution which culminated in the establishment of the Republic of China.

The first day of issue will be October 10, on Chinese National Day. The stamp will also honor the founder of the Chinese Republic, Dr. Sun Yat-sen.

The President expressed the hope that issuance of this stamp will serve as a reminder to the people of free China, to the millions on the mainland of China, and to those who have fled Communist tyranny of the continuing interest and friendship of the American Government and people.

Laos, the United States will not approve any arrangement which would result in communist domination of that country. The President stated that the United States is determined that the Republic of Viet-Nam shall not be lost to the Communists for lack of any support which the United States Government can render.

The President and the Vice President welcomed the announced policies of the new Korean Government to continue its partnership with the free world, to oppose communism, and to combat the economic problems that face the Korean people.

In their discussion of Chinese representation in the United Nations there was a candid and comprehensive exchange of views on all relevant issues including the pending applications for United Nations membership of Outer Mongolia and Mauritania. The President reiterated firm United States support for continued representation of the Republic of China in the United Nations, of which she is a founding member. He also reaffirmed the U.S. determination to continue to oppose admission of the Chinese Communist regime to the United Nations.

The President and the Vice President expressed their intention to support the admission to the United Nations of the nations emerging into independence which meet the qualifications set forth in the charter. In this connection they noted with concern the Soviet veto which has frustrated the admission of Mauritania. The Vice President de-

clared that the Republic of China has consistently supported admission of the newly independent states and that it will continue to support the deserved admission of Mauritania.

The President and the Vice President reviewed conditions on the China mainland. In the economic field, they noted that Communist mismanagement, unworkable agricultural policies, and the commune system have brought serious food shortages and grave hardships to the Chinese people. They noted that reports from refugees and visitors indicate the magnitude of the apathy, discontent, and disillusionment on the mainland of China. They agreed that these developments provide vivid proof that the Communist regime cannot meet the genuine needs and desires of the Chinese people for economic and social progress.

The President and the Vice President discussed United States assistance for the continued economic growth of free China. The President noted the remarkable achievements of the past ten years in Taiwan, which have brought unprecedented improvements in the standard of living, in public health and education, and in industrial and agricultural output. He noted that, in contrast with the disregard for human rights manifested by the Chinese Communist regime, this record was accomplished without violence to the great traditions and human values which have been cherished throughout history by the Chinese people. The President confirmed the intention of the United States Government to continue its military aid program in the Republic of China and to provide substantial assistance to the Republic of China in support of its economic development program designed to achieve accelerated social and economic progress for the welfare of the people of free China.

In conclusion, the President and the Vice President recognized the importance of further strengthening the close cooperation and coordination of both countries in matters affecting their common security interests.

## **Air Talks Open With Venezuela**

Press release 554 dated August 7

At the request of the Government of Venezuela, U.S. and Venezuelan delegations will open civil aviation consultations on August 8 at Washington. The delegations will discuss matters of com-

mon interest concerning the bilateral air transport services agreement of 1953.<sup>1</sup> The chairman of the U.S. delegation will be Charles P. Nolan, Special Adviser, Office of Transport and Communications, Department of State. G. Joseph Minetti, Member, Civil Aeronautics Board, will represent that agency. The Venezuelan delegation will be headed by Dr. Carlos Pérez de la Cova, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of the Embassy of Venezuela. The vice chairman of the Venezuelan delegation will be Lt. Col. Humberto Blanco Rondón, Director of Civil Aeronautics, Ministry of Communications.

## **Results of GATT Tariff Negotiations With Peru, Ceylon, Finland Announced**

The Department of State announced on August 11 (press release 564) that as a result of recent negotiations at Geneva the United States has reached agreement with Peru, Ceylon, and Finland on the amount of compensation that these three countries will give to the United States for the modification or withdrawal of existing tariff concessions under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

The negotiations were held under the provisions of article XXVIII of the GATT, which permits contracting parties at specified intervals to modify the tariff treatment they have agreed to on individual products, subject to negotiations for the purpose of granting commensurate compensation.

The Peruvian negotiation was the largest of the three. The dual purpose behind Peru's extensive withdrawal or modification of concessions was to reform the tariff structure, to encourage industrial development, and to buttress the country's balance-of-payments position by reducing imports of certain goods that can be produced domestically. The amount of U.S. trade in the items withdrawn or modified by Peru amounted to \$16.5 million in 1958, the last full year for which Peruvian statistics are available.

Peru has granted as compensation concessions on items in which the U.S. trade interest was \$20.2 million in 1958. However, \$4.9 million of this total represents "ceiling bindings" which are re-

<sup>1</sup>Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2813 and 3117.

ductions of GATT or statutory rates but not of current lower effective rates. On the other hand, the United States enjoys 61 percent of the trade in the new concession items, as compared to the U.S. share of only 43 percent in the concession items withdrawn or modified. The concessions that were withdrawn by Peru are shown in Peru—Tables A.1 and A.2.<sup>1</sup> The concessions that have been modified though retained in Peru's schedule at higher rates of duty are shown in Peru—Table B. The new concessions on items already in Peru's schedule are shown in Peru—Tables C.1 and C.2, and new concessions on items not previously in Peru's schedule are shown in Peru—Tables D.1 and D.2.

The negotiation with Ceylon was on a much smaller scale. Ceylon modified or withdrew approximately 150 items in its schedule of concessions, 58 of which were initially negotiated with the United States in 1947. However, Ceylon's traditional trading partners have gradually taken over the supplier position briefly enjoyed by the United States at that time, so that by 1959 there was no longer any U.S. trade in half of these 58 concession items, and trade in all of them amounted to only \$1.1 million.

Ceylon's article XXVIII action was dictated by a combination of factors: serious balance-of-payments difficulties, the need for increased governmental revenues, the desire to encourage the growth of certain new industries, and a conviction that the balance of concessions foreseen when these items were listed no longer exists. The United States as well as the other contracting parties to the GATT that negotiated with Ceylon took these factors into account in deciding the amount of compensation considered necessary to reach agreement.

The United States has accepted as compensation reductions on concession rates on three items already in the existing Ceylonese schedule and new concessions on 11 items not previously bound, representing a total U.S. trade of \$243,000 in 1959. The concessions to the United States that Ceylon withdrew are shown in Ceylon—Table A. The concessions on which Ceylon raised the rates are shown in Ceylon—Table B. New concessions to the United States on items not previously bound

are shown in Ceylon—Table C and Ceylon—Table D, respectively.

The negotiation with Finland involved two items initially negotiated with the United States: pears entering during the period August 1–November 30 and cornstarch. The binding was withdrawn on cornstarch.

The concession on pears was modified by a withdrawal of the 10 percent duty on imports during the August–November period and by a reduction of duty from 10 percent to 8 percent on pears entering during the December–July period. In addition to this seasonal concession four other items of potential trade interest were bound to the United States. The concessions withdrawn by Finland are shown in Finland—Table A. Compensatory concessions given to the United States are shown in Finland—Table B.

## Current U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography

*Mimeographed or processed documents (such as those listed below) may be consulted at depository libraries in the United States. U.N. printed publications may be purchased from the Sales Section of the United Nations, United Nations Plaza, New York.*

### Security Council

Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of paragraph B-1 of the Security Council resolution of February 21, 1961, concerning the Congo. S/4841, June 20, 1961, 6 pp.; Add. 1, June 23, 1961, 2 pp.; Add. 2, June 29, 1961, 3 pp.; Add. 3, July 6, 1961, 1 p.

Letter dated June 23, 1961, from the permanent representative of Israel to the President of the Security Council concerning charges against the United Arab Republic (Syria). S/4843, June 23, 1961, 3 pp.

Telegram dated July 5, 1961, from the Chairman of the Committee on South West Africa to the Secretary-General concerning actions of the Republic of South Africa with respect to the Committee. S/4854, July 6, 1961, 3 pp.; Add. 1, July 18, 1961, 14 pp.

Letter dated July 7, 1961, from the permanent representative of the Republic of South Africa concerning the Committee on South West Africa, S/4857, July 8, 1961, 2 pp.; and an aide memoire of July 10, 1961, Add. 1, July 14, 1961, 1 p.

### General Assembly

Note submitted by the International Committee of the Red Cross on legal assistance to refugees. A/AC.96/123. May 24, 1961, 10 pp.

Report on the fifth session of the Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme held at Geneva May 25–31, 1961. A/AC.96/127. June 7, 1961, 48 pp.

Review of the activities and organization of the Secretariat: Report of the Committee of Experts, A/4776, June 14, 1961, 129 pp.; Comments of the Secretary-General on the committee report, A/4794, June 30, 1961, 19 pp.

<sup>1</sup> Not printed here. For tables of concessions withdrawn and modified and new concessions made by Ceylon, Finland, and Peru, see press release 564 dated Aug. 11.

## The Vela Program, Its Importance in Detecting Nuclear Explosions and in Securing an Effective Test Ban Treaty

*Statement by Arthur H. Dean<sup>1</sup>*

For the last 3 days you have heard testimony concerning the technical and scientific aspects of the Vela program,<sup>2</sup> some of it which appears to be rather on the cautionary or pessimistic side, as I read it. As you have seen from the testimony, knowledge in any field is never static. This is particularly true in a new field such as nuclear energy.

I am here to emphasize the continued need for the scientific results of the Vela program, particularly as they relate to this country's efforts to secure an effective agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapon tests and as they bear on our ability to detect nuclear explosions underground or in outer space. Dr. [Peter] Leonard has testified here, and he helped us in the drafting of our proposed treaty provisions on outer space. Other scientists who have also testified here, including Dr. Richard Latter and Dr. Carl Romny, have also helped us; but the drafting and responsibility is the State Department's and not the scientists'.

Let me be clear. I am, of course, not expressing an opinion on whether the Vela underground nuclear detonations should take place and, if so, when, as that is, of course, a matter which must be decided by the President. By my testimony here, I do not wish to express any opinion as to

whether the very real scientific need for this program may or may not be outweighed by other factors not related to the program. Again, this is a decision which only the President can make.

Technically there is no moratorium in existence on any nuclear explosions in this country. On December 29, 1959, at the end of a declared moratorium which had existed for over a year, President Eisenhower said,<sup>3</sup> "... we consider ourselves free to resume nuclear weapons testing . . . ." Because, at that time, we were resuming "negotiations in a continuing spirit of seeking to reach a safeguarded agreement," President Eisenhower declared a "voluntary suspension of nuclear weapons tests" which could be terminated at any time.

It is this voluntary suspension which is now in effect.

### Origin of the Vela Program

The Vela program evolved originally from the recommendations set forth in the 1959 report of the Panel on Seismic Improvement, otherwise known as the Berkner panel.<sup>4</sup> As President Eisenhower announced on May 7, 1960,<sup>5</sup> the program is designed to provide "full understanding of both the capabilities of the presently proposed detection system and the potential for improvements in this system . . . ."

The Vela program was thus initiated primarily

<sup>1</sup> Made before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on July 27 (press release 534). Ambassador Dean is U.S. Representative to the Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapon Tests.

<sup>2</sup> For an announcement of the program, see BULLETIN of May 23, 1960, p. 819.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Jan. 18, 1960, p. 78.

<sup>4</sup> For a summary of the panel's conclusions reported on Mar. 18, 1959, see *ibid.*, July 6, 1959, p. 18.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, May 23, 1960, p. 819.



## Mr. Dean Returns to Geneva; President Hopes for Success of Negotiations

Statement by President Kennedy<sup>1</sup>

I now have a report from the special panel on nuclear testing.<sup>2</sup> This panel has examined a broad range of issues concerning our capabilities to detect and identify nuclear explosions. It has also gone into certain technical questions relating to nuclear weapons development. Although the report is made up of highly classified materials and cannot be released for that reason, I can say that as far as I am concerned this report has made me feel more urgently than ever that, without an inspection system of the kind proposed by the United States and the United Kingdom at Geneva, no country in the world can ever be sure that a nation with a closed society is not conducting secret nuclear tests.

In view of this report and in view of the deep longing of the people of the world for an effective end to nuclear testing, I am asking Ambassador Dean to return to Geneva on August 24 in an effort to ascertain whether the Soviet Union is now prepared to bring a safeguarded test ban agreement into being. It is my hope that he will succeed in convincing the Soviet representatives that the test ban treaty which we have proposed and stand ready to use as a basis for serious negotiations is a necessary and rational means of reducing the likelihood of nuclear war and, if we are successful, would be an admirable beginning in the long road toward general disarmament.

His return to Geneva is with our hopes and prayers, and I believe with the hopes and prayers of all mankind who are most concerned about further developments of this deadly weapon. This meeting is most important, most critical, and I am hopeful that we will find a favorable response by those who participate in this negotiation.

<sup>1</sup> Read by the President at a news conference on Aug. 10.

<sup>2</sup> For an announcement of the members of the panel, see BULLETIN of Aug. 7, 1961, p. 238.

to provide the necessary scientific information to establish and improve the capability of the system for detection and identification of nuclear explosions proposed at the Geneva negotiations.<sup>3</sup>

Messrs. McCloy [John J. McCloy, Adviser

<sup>3</sup> For a history of the political and technical developments of the negotiations at the Geneva Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapon Tests, see *ibid.*, Sept. 26, 1960, p. 482.

to the President on Disarmament] and Fisher [Adrian S. Fisher, Deputy to the Adviser] and I have met with members of this committee several times during these negotiations to give you status reports, and you are all well aware of the position the nuclear test ban negotiations are now in at Geneva.

## U.S. Proposals at Geneva Since March 21, 1961

Briefly, beginning on March 21 of this year, the United States and the United Kingdom introduced at Geneva a large number of new proposals dealing with the principal unresolved issues at the conference—the top control commission, the method of appointing the executive administrator and his first deputy, the makeup of on-site inspection teams, the citizenship of the chiefs of control posts, the number of annual on-site inspections on Soviet territory, the number of control stations on Soviet territory, the criteria for locating unidentified earth tremors, the length of a proposed moratorium on tests registering below 4.75 on the seismic scale of magnitude, a moratorium which is not to begin until the proposed treaty is signed. One of our most important new proposals would give the Soviet Union and states associated with it four seats—or a position of equality with the United States, the United Kingdom, and states associated with them—on the top policymaking control commission; and it would give three seats to nonassociated states. The control commission would thus have a total of 11 seats with a majority of 6.

The new proposals would also go as far as reasonably possible, consistent with the technical and organizational requirements of effective control, to accommodate Soviet sensitivities concerning inspection and other necessities of control. Contrary to some of the testimony you have heard here, our scientific advice—both British and American—was that the control system set forth in our treaty would provide reasonably adequate control over those regions which the treaty purported to control. Of course, you can always spend more money and hire more men.

On April 18, 1961, the United States and the United Kingdom introduced a complete draft treaty text<sup>4</sup> with respect to tests yielding 4.75 and

<sup>4</sup> For text, see *ibid.*, June 5, 1961, p. 870.



above on the seismic scale of magnitude. We were and are prepared to sign this draft treaty or to use it as a basis for further negotiation.

#### **Soviet "Proposals" at Geneva Since March 21, 1961**

The Soviet Union, on the other hand, has not introduced a single positive proposal within the past year and a half. Instead, since March 21, it has retreated from agreements already reached. Its most significant backward step was a new proposal that day-by-day executive authority over the international control system be exercised by a three-member administrative council (including a representative of the United States and the United Kingdom, a representative of the U.S.S.R., and a neutral representative) which could act only by unanimous consent.

As you know, this administrative council, below the 11-man top control commission, is what we sometimes call the "troika" or "three-headed monster." The "troika" proposal retracted the Soviet Union's earlier agreement to a single administrator, who would be appointed with the concurrence of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R.

The administrator would carry out the provisions of the treaty and the policy directives of the top control commission, upon which, as I have said, the U.S.S.R. and countries associated with it would have equal representation. In addition there would be three neutrals in the top administration.

While a single administrator could take action rapidly, effectively, and impartially, action by the three-man administrative council could be blocked, or delayed, or hamstrung by the veto of any of the three members.

Of course, Premier Khrushchev has said if—and this is a big "if"—that if it can be proved by scientific means alone—which it cannot—that the suspicious event was a nuclear explosion, then, within the limits of three times a year, on Soviet territory, the United Kingdom and the United States would have the right to have inspections on Soviet territory, but then only if we could pinpoint the unidentified event to an area 10 miles square—the size of the District of Columbia—which science cannot do—and then only if the inspection teams on Soviet territory were headed up by Soviet citizens—which is no inspection at all.

Other positions the U.S.S.R. takes at Geneva would also frustrate the concept of effective control. Chief among these are (a) the determination to limit inspection of suspicious events in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Soviet Union to three annually, as I have mentioned; (b) the demand for a delay of 4 years after treaty ratification before control operations begin; and (c) insistence on provisions permitting self-inspection, for example by turning over direction of all control posts and inspection teams in the U.S.S.R. to nationals of the Soviet Union.

The latest developments are (1) the exchange of notes concluding with the United States note of July 15 and (2) the request by the United States and the United Kingdom on July 15, 1961, that an item entitled "The Urgent Need for a Treaty To Ban Nuclear Weapons Tests Under Effective International Control" be included on the agenda of the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.<sup>9</sup>

I believe the committee has been given copies of all these documents. If not, they will be furnished to you.

#### **Status of Negotiations on Research Program**

I should also like to summarize the status of the negotiations with the Soviet Union concerning the research program, included in Vela, which has been discussed at Geneva. As the committee's 1960 report<sup>10</sup> points out (page 8), the Berkner panel exposed deficiencies in the 1958 [Conference of] Experts report<sup>10</sup> which had been based upon the data available at that time, data which did not include the results of the Hardtack II series of underground nuclear explosions. In addition calculations by Dr. Richard Latter, who has testified here, and others indicated the possibility of decoupling, a possibility which was proven by the Cowboy series of small chemical explosions.

As the result of this new information, the

<sup>9</sup> For texts of U.S. notes of June 17 and July 15, a Soviet aide memoire of June 4 and note of July 5, and a U.S.-U.K. letter to the United Nations, see *ibid.*, July 3, 1961, p. 18, and July 31, 1961, p. 184.

<sup>10</sup> *Technical Aspects of Detection and Inspection of Controls of a Nuclear Weapons Test Ban: Summary-Analysis of Hearings April 19, 20, 21, and 22, 1960.* Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. May 1960. [Committee print.]

<sup>11</sup> For text, see BULLETIN of Sept. 22, 1958, p. 453.

United States proposed that the treaty prohibit only those underground nuclear weapon tests which produced earth tremors of more than 4.75 and above seismic magnitude, that a 3-year moratorium starting from the date of the treaty be declared on tests of less than 4.75, and that a research program be instituted to evolve effective control methods for tests covered by the moratorium. This proposal was made in a joint declaration by President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan on March 29, 1960.<sup>11</sup>

At Geneva, Ambassador Tsarapkin [Semyon Tsarapkin, Soviet representative] appeared to agree in principle to the March 1960 proposal. Scientists from the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union met to discuss the research program in May of 1960 and, with few exceptions, agreed upon the need for and the scope of the program.

However, the general agreement of these scientists was disowned by the Soviet Union on June 3, 1960, after the collapse of the Paris summit conference.

I renewed the research offer and the offer to the Soviets to participate on March 21, 1961. I said:

Although our move, taken in order to reach agreement, involves an unprecedented step in this age of heretofore complete secrecy on nuclear devices, I am able to inform you that, if agreement on other treaty provisions is in sight, the President of the United States is prepared to request appropriate action from the Congress in regard to the Atomic Energy Act so as to allow the United States to show the Soviet Union the internal mechanism of the nuclear devices to be used in the seismic research program. . . .

While on this subject, both Western representatives would like to urge their Soviet colleague to have his Government reconsider its decision of June last not to implement the seismic research program planned by Soviet experts and communicated to their Western colleagues during May 1960.

We are certain that the U.S.S.R. could make a valuable contribution to the [seismic research] efforts of the two Western countries. A Soviet seismic research program would clearly be a sign of Soviet good will and readiness to cooperate in what will have to be a great range of common endeavors involved in implementing this treaty. It could be an extension of the type of coordinated action included in the International Geophysical Year and would add much to the sum total of scientific knowledge.

This is quite apart from the participation, which will occur in any case, of Soviet scientists in the carrying out of the United Kingdom and United States seismic research

program; all three powers are in general agreement on what has been achieved by that program; it will help each of us to decide what to do at the end of the moratorium period.

#### **Soviet Objection to "Decoupling"**

While the Soviet Union has not objected to the conduct by the United States of a research program which included underground nuclear explosions at which they could be present, it has objected vehemently and often to the decoupled explosions which are designed to increase our knowledge concerning such explosions and methods of detecting them, and it has insisted upon inspection of the nuclear devices used in the program on the ground that such inspection was necessary to establish that we were not really, under the guise of a seismic research program, testing heretofore untested weapons.

The Soviets argue, of course, that we only want to conduct decoupling shot nuclear experiments in order to learn better how to "cheat" underground; that is, to get a much bigger yield without the explosion registering as much as 4.75 on the seismic scale of magnitude.

The use of the word "cheat" is, of course, a misnomer as to events registering less than 4.75, because the proposed treaty would not even apply to them. The Soviets maintain that once we have produced large-yield explosions underground by the decoupling technique which would not register 4.75 or higher, we won't extend the proposed moratorium but will try to hold the Soviet Union to the treaty not to conduct nuclear tests yielding 4.75 and above.

Thus they demand that the proposed uninspected, uncontrolled 3-year moratorium be extended indefinitely until we agree to lower the treaty threshold on the basis of the results of the seismic research program.

We have agreed to the Soviet inspection on the terms stated during the seismic research tests, if a treaty is signed or in sight. This, of course, involves a Presidential recommendation and congressional action. We have not agreed to eliminate the decoupling shots or to give the Soviets a veto over any part of the seismic research program, and I have on a number of occasions made this crystal clear to my Soviet colleague at Geneva.

But Mr. Tsarapkin, the Soviet negotiator in Geneva, has issued a virtual Soviet ultimatum, de-

<sup>11</sup> For text, see *ibid.*, Apr. 18, 1960, p. 587.

manding that the West either accept the Soviet proposal for an administrative veto over the control organization by vesting the administration of the treaty control system below the 11-man control commission in a triumvirate requiring unanimity before action, or else that the West agree to merge the nuclear test ban talks with those scheduled for general disarmament.

This is contrary to fact and contrary to common sense.

Suppose there were a vote in the 11-man top control organization. Further suppose it went in the West's favor, 4 plus 2 neutrals against 4 Soviet votes plus 1 neutral, or 6 to 5.

Under our plan the single administrator would carry out the decision. Under the Soviet "troika" proposal the three administrators at the executive level would again vote and debate—instead of acting—and the Soviet administrator could veto the decision.

Also bear in mind under our plan the 11-man top control commission appoints the single administrator. Under the Soviet "troika" plan each original party would appoint its own nominee in violation of all well-recognized international organization rules.

Let us be clear. The "troika" proposal is not equality. It is anarchy. It would permit sabotage of the control system at the administrative level.

The West, for good reasons, rejected both proposals: the first because the tripartite idea would prevent the prompt and effective administration of enforcement measures or treaty rights; the second on the grounds that a merger of the test ban with general disarmament talks would postpone any test ban treaty to the indefinite future when overall agreement could be obtained on disarmament.

It seems to be very difficult to make clear to some people that we were the ones who suggested the three neutrals on the 11-man top control commission. It has been suggested that we rejected the "troika" because we don't want neutrals in the control organization. But as I have just demonstrated, the vote of the single Soviet administrator could nullify the vote of the two neutrals on the top 11-man control commission.

That is where matters now stand. The contemplated underground nuclear research explo-

sions have not been authorized by the President, and a nuclear test ban treaty has not been signed and is not in sight.

#### **Effective Test Ban Treaty a Prime U.S. Objective**

Despite the lack of agreement at Geneva, an "international agreement for the discontinuance of nuclear weapon tests is and will continue to be a prime objective of the United States Government," as our Government said in its note to the Soviet Union on June 17, 1961.<sup>12</sup>

Our draft treaty is the product of almost 3 years of effort on the part of the United States and the United Kingdom to work out an effective agreement with the Soviet Union to which we hope other governments would promptly adhere. Such an agreement would help to stop the dangerous proliferation of nuclear weapon capabilities. It would eliminate the concern over fallout. It would provide an agreed first step toward controlled disarmament and might possibly ease East-West tensions, if indeed that is possible in view of the Soviet demands with respect to West Berlin.<sup>13</sup>

As our Government's note of June 17, 1961, stated:

To a world grown impatient with protracted tensions and unease, it would signify the willingness of the major powers to subordinate a narrow concept of their national interests to the higher aim of creating a more peaceful and stable world order.

Because an effective test ban agreement holds out such a great hope to the world, President Kennedy has said that we would stand by our draft treaty at Geneva despite the Soviets' unreasonable refusal to come to terms with us.

#### **Value of Continuing Vela Program**

To my mind this reaffirms my belief that we should continue the Vela program, with the actual nuclear testing deferred for Presidential decision.

Its results would be useful to complete our actual knowledge concerning the detection capabilities of the control system we proposed in our treaty at Geneva, and it would add to the sum

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, July 3, 1961, p. 18.

<sup>13</sup> For background, see *ibid.*, July 17, 1961, p. 107; Aug. 7, 1961, p. 223; and Aug. 14, 1961, p. 267.

total of scientific knowledge in this field. We have much theory but not many proven facts.

Its results are also necessary in order to determine what improvements can be made in the proposed treaty system. Despite some of the negative testimony you have heard here, a sound basic research program is bound to bring unforeseen results and may to some extent offset the suggested improvements in decoupling techniques even though some of the scientists are currently pessimistic.

If the results are encouraging, we may be able to detect, and identify as earthquakes and therefore not nuclear explosions, small earth tremors which do not register as much as 4.75 on the seismic scale, the threshold established by our draft treaty.

At the end of the proposed 3-year uncontrolled and uninspected moratorium period—depending upon the outcome of the seismic research program and the then state of our seismic knowledge—we might then be able to lower the treaty threshold. Since this, in combination with our proposal to limit the moratorium to 3 years, is a major issue which now stands in the way of agreement, we might bring agreement closer by the proposed seismic research program. At least we would know much more about what we are doing.

In all basic research little can be promised in actual results or on time. Sometimes we find things of great value for which we were not looking. In my private capacity I am chairman of the Board of Trustees of Cornell University, where we concentrate on basic and not applied research. Scientists generally won't promise you much, but give them the tools and they will often amaze you at what they can find.

#### **Making the Western Position Clear to World**

We have made major and constructive moves at Geneva in an effort to get an effective and workable nuclear test ban treaty and moratorium. We have had the most complete cooperation and help from our British colleagues, for which we are most thankful. We are in complete agreement.

We plan to follow fundamental American precepts of plain talk and fair dealing, patient and careful research, and an ironclad determination, as President Kennedy so clearly enunciated on West Berlin, not to yield basic points merely for the sake of agreement.

We shall continue to tell our position at Geneva unashamedly in simple and straightforward fashion, and repeat it again and again until it is understood, not only at the negotiating table but all over the world.

The Soviet Union has denounced these simple American tactics as unfair and has expected us to yield. For as a people we like results and not yakity-yak or talk.

They have protested bitterly about our tabling a complete text of a nuclear test ban treaty and saying we are ready to sign it and expounding its provisions day after day in clear language. We have done that. We shall continue to do it.

Thus we should continue the Vela program because, in my judgment, it will materially add to our seismological knowledge, which is presently very limited, and will aid in bringing about an international agreement for the discontinuance of nuclear weapon tests, which President Kennedy has authorized me to say continues to be a prime objective of the United States Government.

### **Department Supports Continuation of Refugee and Migration Programs**

*Statement by Roger W. Jones  
Deputy Under Secretary for Administration<sup>1</sup>*

The State Department appreciates this opportunity to discuss with the committee the refugee and migration programs authorized for continuance in H.R. 8291, the bill before you today.

The President's letter<sup>2</sup> to the Speaker set forth the reasons why the administration has presented these programs separately from the legislative proposals for foreign aid. In summary the reasons are three in number. First, the administration considers the continued participation in the programs of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to be of such importance as to warrant distinct and separate legislative authoriza-

<sup>1</sup> Made before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Judiciary Committee on Aug. 3 (press release 548). For a statement made by Mr. Jones on July 12 before the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees of the Senate Judiciary Committee, see BULLETIN of Aug. 7, 1961, p. 257.

<sup>2</sup> For text, see *ibid.*, p. 255.



tion. Second, the United States Escapee Program (USEP) and the domestic program for aiding Cuban refugees now in the United States bear no relationship to the purposes of the aid bill. Third, there is need for a clear legislative mandate to enable the President to assist other refugees if unforeseen emergencies arise in the future.

Over the past several years we all have been gratified with the splendid results achieved in solving many of the world's refugee problems and in diminishing others. I think we as Americans can take genuine pride in the record which this country has made both by the Government and privately in supporting the various refugee aid programs. In addition to our regular generous support of international refugee programs both in cash and in major contributions of surplus food, we have taken our fair share of the refugees seeking an opportunity to resettle in countries overseas. In spite of some occasional criticism that the United States didn't give enough during the World Refugee Year and that the United States hasn't permitted larger numbers of refugees to be admitted, there is no need for any American to be apologetic. Our leadership has been that of doing and giving.

The Department thinks particular mention should be made of the decidedly improved refugee situation presently prevailing in Europe. In the few short years since the chairman [Representative Francis E. Walter] assisted in the establishment of ICEM, since USEP was launched, and since the program of the UNHCR began, a tremendous change has taken place. I dare say that you, Mr. Chairman, and the people working with you at that time hardly dared to hope for the virtual clearance of the thousands of refugees throughout Europe from the squalid and depressing camps in which they were forced to live. No one at that time could have predicted or would have been willing to predict the movement by ICEM to date of well over a million migrants and refugees. No one could have predicted the mass exodus of over 200,000 Hungarians in a period of weeks. It would have been even harder to have foreseen the immediate worldwide reaction to helping these escapees from Communist tyranny and the rapidity with which almost the entire group was resettled or locally integrated. The rapidity and extent to which most of the war-damaged European countries have regained eco-

nomic strength has been a virtual miracle of modern times. Many refugees and escapees have benefited from this economic recovery. More would be able to obtain employment if the acute shortage of housing did not preclude matching employable refugees with housing in areas short of manpower.

It has been equally gratifying to witness the humane actions of a number of countries in easing their restrictions for admitting refugees. As a result of these easements, many of the physically handicapped refugees and their dependents who have been bypassed by immigration selection missions year after year have now been resettled. Although tuberculosis, physical handicaps, and chronic diseases are still a deterrent to refugees seeking admission into a new country, they no longer present an insurmountable barrier. In consequence many of the most difficult to resettle cases, sometimes referred to as the "hard core" cases, have been moved. They are now being given a chance to begin life anew under the generous sponsorship of agencies and individuals genuinely interested in them.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I want to refer in somewhat greater detail to the three programs included in this bill for which the Department of State has primary responsibility. In doing so I shall outline briefly for each program the origin and past accomplishments, the present situation, and the future plans for those programs as envisaged by the Department of State.

#### **Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration**

The Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) was organized on United States initiative in Brussels in 1951. The membership has grown from the 15 original member governments to 30, including 10 Latin American governments. ICEM was originally established to facilitate the movement of indigenous migrants and refugees from certain countries in Europe facing pressures of population and refugees to overseas countries which offered opportunities for the absorption of manpower. Thus, between 1952 and 1960 ICEM moved 1,004,080 persons from Europe, of whom 408,311 were refugees. Of the 408,311 refugees, 78,010 were Hungarian refugees from the Hungarian revolt in 1956. In addition, ICEM organized the embarkation of 50,000 other

Hungarian refugees from Austria and Yugoslavia for whom transport was provided directly by the receiving governments. During the same period ICEM moved an additional 15,168 refugees of European origin from mainland China through Hong Kong to permanent resettlement overseas.

Although the economies of some of the emigration countries in Europe (notably Germany) have improved, the economic situation in the Latin American countries has worsened. These countries need assistance in securing skilled and semi-skilled workers. Certain other countries—Australia, Canada, and New Zealand—need manpower to support their developing economies. Austria, Greece, Italy, Spain, and the Netherlands still have larger populations than their economies can absorb. In addition Belgium, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, and Spain are faced with the necessity of relocating and reestablishing their nationals who are returning to their countries from overseas areas, particularly from Africa.

Now, in 1961, ICEM proposes to move approximately 100,000 persons from Europe to Latin America, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and other countries. ICEM is continuing to develop and refine service projects of benefit to the Latin American countries. Efforts are being made to increase the contributions of other governments, to introduce loan arrangements, and to increase migrant participation in transport costs in order to reduce ICEM dependence on the United States contribution. In 1961 the United States contribution has been reduced from 45 percent to about 40 percent of the total government contribution, due in large measure to these factors.

The developments just mentioned and the continuing flow of refugees from the Communist-dominated countries of Europe present a challenge to the United States to facilitate and participate in the reshaping of the ICEM program which should take place in the next few years. Readjustment is necessary in order to build up the services for the benefit of the Latin American countries to help them to secure the numbers and the quality of migrants needed for their economic development. The United States also has an interest in encouraging developments through ICEM in which governments, irrespective of their relative economic position, are finding that they are dependent on each other and have a common interest in developing a cooperative in-

ternational institution in the field of migration as a useful agency in a functioning free world. It is important to assist in the movement of persons to developing countries in need of manpower—the most valuable asset of the free world. The contribution of the United States, together with other free nations, to international migration assistance programs helps build and strengthen developing countries, and thus the free world. It also enlarges the opportunities of individuals to live useful, productive lives, an ideal of American democracy to which we are firmly committed and which bears testimony to the importance of the individual in free societies.

In 1962 and the following years it is expected that movement will remain at or near the 100,000 annual rate, with increasing numbers of skilled workers being resettled in Latin America. In this period it is expected that the financial participation of other governments will increase, that migrant participation will increase, and that the United States can decrease its contribution until it reaches a level of 33 percent of all government contributions to operations, and possibly lower.

#### **United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees**

The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) was established by the United Nations General Assembly in 1951 to provide for the legal and political protection of refugees. His mandate was developed with the problem of European refugees primarily in mind and has been administered on that basis. The United States took leadership in the establishment of the UNHCR, consistent with its strong political and humanitarian interest in stabilizing the status of refugees from communism and other forms of persecution. The United States has contributed, through the regular United Nations budget, 32.51 percent of the administrative expenses of the UNHCR office. Most of the free countries of Europe and many other countries have ratified the 1951 convention relating to the status of refugees, which is the effective instrument for realizing the objectives of the UNHCR office.

In 1955 the UNHCR developed a regular assistance program for refugees under his mandate known as the United Nations Refugee Fund (UNREF), with the objective of providing permanent solution for the older group of Soviet bloc

refugees. This program was carried out from 1955 through 1958, with total contributions from governments of \$16 million, of which the United States contributed \$5,333,333. A 25-nation executive committee supervised the execution of the UNREF program and continues this function with the UNHCR regular assistance program which supplanted the UNREF program in 1959. The United States has contributed approximately \$3,100,000 to the regular UNHCR program. During World Refugee Year the UNHCR program received substantial additional contributions from governmental and private sources, which enabled it to make marked progress in reducing the refugee problem in Europe, especially in the clearance of camps. The total UNHCR budget during World Refugee Year was \$12 million.

The present UNHCR program provides rehabilitation assistance, including a large percentage of handicapped cases, to European refugees in Europe and the Near East, to Jewish refugees in Europe from the United Arab Republic, and to European refugees from Communist China exiting through Hong Kong. In addition the UNHCR in conjunction with the League of Red Cross Societies provides relief to 300,000 Algerian refugees in Morocco and Tunisia.

Together the UNREF and UNHCR programs have furnished major aid to 81,505 refugees in Europe, including 46,151 who have been firmly settled directly through UNHCR assistance and 17,762 who are in course of settlement. Approximately 17,500 additional refugees have benefited from minor supplementary aid or vocational training. Within the overall program the camp clearance program in Europe has resulted in the firm settlement of 21,122 refugees from camps, and the Department believes that all official camps probably can be cleared within the next year.

The UNHCR is now concentrating on country clearance programs in Europe, with particular emphasis on handicapped cases, covering the total needy out-of-camp population. The program is also expending residual funds from WRY, chiefly in the field of housing for refugees. The total United States contribution of \$8,433,000 to the UNHCR regular and UNREF programs, together with other contributions from other sources, has enabled the UNHCR to expend or commit over \$31 million. This action, in turn, has been instrumental in attracting supporting contributions of over \$41 million for specific proj-

ects from the asylum countries. The total of aid from all sources for refugees under the UNREF and UNHCR programs is thus over \$72 million.

The UNHCR program in behalf of Algerian refugees is carried out under the mandate of special United Nations General Assembly resolutions on this subject. In addition, pertinent United Nations General Assembly resolutions have charged the High Commissioner with exercising his good offices in behalf of Chinese refugees in Hong Kong and of other refugees throughout the world who are not the immediate concern of the United Nations. Under these resolutions the High Commissioner has developed substantial funds for refugees in Hong Kong, Cambodia, and Europe and has taken under advisement the request of the Secretary-General to assume the overall coordination of the relief effort in behalf of refugees in the Congo from Angola.

In fiscal year 1961 the United States contributed \$800,000 to the UNHCR regular program and \$500,000 to the UNHCR program for Algerian refugees.

With the continuing development of sound economic conditions in European countries, it is anticipated for the future that the UNHCR assistance program in Europe will progressively decline in scope and that the High Commissioner will devote increasing attention to his legal and political protection function for refugees under his mandate. With the development of new refugee problems arising from troubled conditions throughout the world, the High Commissioner is expected in the future to expand the implementation of his good offices function through which he seeks to attract international cooperation and financial contributions and by which he facilitates solutions for refugee problems.

#### **United States Escapee Program**

The United States Escapee Program (USEP), established in 1952, provides reception, interim care and maintenance, resettlement, and local integration assistance to recent escapees from the Soviet Union and satellite countries in Europe and to selected escapee groups or individuals in other areas of the world including the Far East. The purpose of this unilateral effort is to serve the United States interests by demonstrating the concern of the West for those who escape Communist oppression and seek asylum in the free countries of the world.



Operating primarily through contracts with the nonprofit voluntary agencies, the United States Escapee Program reimburses these agencies for actual expenses incurred under individually approved projects that implement escapee program policy objectives and are in keeping with the humanitarian objectives of the agencies themselves. All projects, closely supervised by the USEP staff, are developed with an eye to the overall operational objective of establishing the escapees as useful and self-sustaining citizens of the free-world community.

By effecting the resettlement of escapees from the countries bordering the Iron Curtain, the escapee program helps to alleviate the serious economic and political impact of the escapees on the countries in which they seek asylum. Thus the program has helped to promote the initiation or retention of liberal asylum policies for those who continue to seek haven.

The escapee program in the Far East centered in Hong Kong and operating as the Far East Refugee Program (FERP) serves the same national objectives as does USEP elsewhere. Moreover, through its assistance to selected Chinese refugees, the Far East Refugee Program repudiates Communist propaganda allegations that United States policy discriminates against non-European peoples, strengthens the anti-Communist resolve of the refugee leaders, and plays a considerable role in stimulating the local authorities toward providing increasing mass relief and rehabilitation measures.

Considerable progress has been made in reducing the number of escapees in need of assistance since the United States Escapee Program was established in 1952 despite a large backlog accumulated since and before 1948 and the fact that tens of thousands—over 200,000 Hungarians in 1956–57 alone—have escaped during this period. From 1952 through March 31, 1961, 143,544 escapees have been resettled in other countries from Europe and the Near East while 34,554 have been integrated in first-asylum countries. During the same period the Far East Refugee Program has resettled 23,556 escapees from Hong Kong and has provided local integration and other assistance to 413,043 others. Overall the United States Escapee Program has assisted more than 660,000 individual escapees.

By the end of 1961 it is estimated that USEP will have approximately 6,000 escapees on the case-

load (exclusive of the Far East) with some 8,000 escapees in Europe and the Near East added during 1962. By the end of 1962 it is expected that over 8,000 of these escapees will have been reestablished due to program services and efforts during the year. In 1955 the administration established a policy that all escapees eligible for USEP assistance who were registered by the voluntary agencies must be resettled or firmly integrated within a period of 3 years from the date of their registration. This procedure has assured priority attention on the USEP caseload by the agencies. The procedure has also assured a USEP caseload of recently arrived escapees upon whose permanent solution the agencies could devote current and active efforts.

In the Far East program projects will continue to place emphasis, on a selective basis, upon the rehabilitation of professional, intellectual, and other leadership elements by resettlement in other countries where possible, or by integration within Hong Kong. Development of local medical facilities and the provision for education and orientation of the youth among the Chinese refugees will continue to receive FERP priority consideration. The continuing distribution of United States surplus commodities under provisions of P.L. 480 will complement the various types of United States and international assistance rendered the Chinese refugees.

It has been noted that considerable progress has been made in reducing the total number of escapees on the USEP caseload in Europe and the Near East and that many Far East refugees have been assisted. However, experience has shown that the refugee problem is anything but static. It is continually changing in its nature, in its dimensions, and in its location. It is constant only in one respect: It will continue to exist as long as conditions exist which create it—political tyranny, international conflicts, and tensions. It is not, therefore, a problem which can be defined at once for all time nor met by establishing a program for a specified number of years with a specified amount of money.

Current refugee situations which have already developed into problems affecting United States interests include the Tibetans in India and Nepal, Angolan and Baluba refugees and refugees from Ruanda-Urundi in the Congo, Meo Tribe refugees in Laos, the Khmer Krom refugees fleeing from south Viet-Nam into Cambodia, Cuban refugees in



Central and South American countries, and the question of the ultimate status of the Algerian refugees in Morocco and Tunisia. Recognizing the dynamic and unpredictable nature of refugee problems, the United States Escapee Program will continue, as it has in the past, to be alert to the ever-changing refugee situations and to appraise each development in light of United States interests and to determine the appropriate action in each case.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I should like to emphasize that although continued support of the refugee and migration programs under review by this committee could be fully justified on a humanitarian basis alone, all of the programs are of utmost importance to our foreign policy in terms of their economic, social, political, and spiritual significance.

Our sustained interest in and concern for the stateless, unsettled victims of Communist oppression will keep alive the hope of the refugees and escapees who have been successful in evading the border guards—the mined stretches of “no man’s land”—and have reached asylum in a friendly country. Of equal importance, a manifestation of our willingness to help these people will give continued assurance to the thousands making up the captive populations behind the Iron Curtain that this country and the free world are still mindful of their tragic lot and have not forsaken them. Their opposition to slavery and oppression is worthy of statutory underwriting.

Mr. Chairman, it is for these reasons that the administration has placed a high priority on the continuation of these programs and seeks the same warm and favorable endorsement of them by this committee and by the Congress which has obtained in previous congressional authorization and appropriation legislation.

## Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

### 87th Congress, 1st Session

Caribbean Organization. Hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on S.J. Res. 75, providing for U.S. acceptance of the agreement for the establishment of the Caribbean Organization. May 2, 1961. 40 pp.

Semiannual report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. Let-

ter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting the semiannual report for the period January 1 through June 30, 1960. H. Doc. 154. May 4, 1961. 83 pp.

International Payments Imbalance and Need for Strengthening International Financial Arrangements. Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of the Joint Economic Committee. May 16–June 21, 1961. 340 pp.

Extension of Mexican Farm Labor Program. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee on S. 1406, S. 1945, and H.R. 2010, bills to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to provide in connection with the employment of workers from Mexico protection for the employment opportunities of agricultural workers in the United States, and for other purposes. June 12–13, 1961. 364 pp.

The Peace Corps. Hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on S. 2000, a bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower. June 22–23, 1961. 254 pp.

Immigration Aspects of the International Educational Exchange Program. Report of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Judiciary Committee. H. Rept. 721. July 17, 1961. 126 pp.

United States Aid Operations in Peru. Fourth report by the Committee on Government Operations. H. Rept. 795. July 26, 1961. 39 pp.

Study Mission to Eastern [American] Samoa. Report of Senators Oren E. Long and Ernest Gruening to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. Doc. 38. July 17, 1961. 184 pp.

Temporary Reduction in Duty-Free Allowance for Returning Residents. Conference report to accompany H.R. 6611. H. Rept. 801. July 27, 1961. 2 pp.

Permitting Certain Foreign-Flag Vessels To Land Their Catches of Fish in the Virgin Islands in Certain Circumstances. Report to accompany H.R. 3159. H. Rept. 830. August 1, 1961. 5 pp.

Implementing the Provisions of the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954. Report to accompany H.R. 8152. H. Rept. 838. August 2, 1961. 9 pp.

## TREATY INFORMATION

### Current Actions

#### MULTILATERAL

##### Agriculture

Protocol of amendment to the convention on the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences of January 15, 1944 (58 Stat. 1163). Opened for signature at Washington December 1, 1958.<sup>1</sup>

*Adherence deposited:* Panama, July 6, 1961.

##### Automotive Traffic

Convention concerning customs facilities for touring. Done at New York June 4, 1954. Entered into force September 11, 1957. TIAS 3879.

*Assumed applicable rights and obligations of the United Kingdom:* Nigeria, June 20, 1961.

<sup>1</sup> Not in force.

## Aviation

Convention on the international recognition of rights in aircraft. Done at Geneva June 19, 1948. Entered into force September 17, 1953. TIAS 2847.

*Ratification deposited:* Cuba, June 20, 1961.

## Cultural Property

Convention for protection of cultural property in event of armed conflict, and regulations of execution;

Protocol for protection of cultural property in event of armed conflict. Done at The Hague May 14, 1954.

Entered into force August 7, 1956.<sup>2</sup>

*Accession deposited:* Nigeria, June 5, 1961.

## Postal Matters

Convention of the Postal Union of the Americas and Spain, final protocol, and regulations of execution. Signed at Buenos Aires October 14, 1960. Entered into force March 1, 1961.

*Signatures:* Argentina,<sup>2</sup> Bolivia,<sup>2</sup> Brazil,<sup>2</sup> Canada,<sup>2</sup> Chile,<sup>2</sup> Colombia,<sup>2</sup> Costa Rica,<sup>2</sup> Cuba,<sup>2</sup> Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador,<sup>2</sup> Guatemala, Haiti,<sup>2</sup> Honduras,<sup>2</sup> Mexico,<sup>2</sup> Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay,<sup>2</sup> Peru,<sup>2</sup> Spain,<sup>2</sup> United States,<sup>2</sup> Uruguay,<sup>2</sup> Venezuela.

Agreement relative to parcel post, final protocol, and regulations of execution of the Postal Union of the Americas and Spain. Signed at Buenos Aires October 14, 1960. Entered into force March 1, 1961.

*Signatures:* Argentina,<sup>2</sup> Bolivia,<sup>2</sup> Brazil,<sup>2</sup> Canada, Chile,<sup>2</sup> Colombia,<sup>2</sup> Costa Rica, Cuba,<sup>2</sup> Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador,<sup>2</sup> Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras,<sup>2</sup> Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay,<sup>2</sup> Peru, Spain,<sup>2</sup> United States,<sup>2</sup> Uruguay,<sup>2</sup> Venezuela.

Agreement relative to money orders and final protocol of the Postal Union of the Americas and Spain. Signed at Buenos Aires October 14, 1960. Entered into force March 1, 1961.

*Signatures:* Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Spain, United States,<sup>2</sup> Uruguay, Venezuela.

## Telecommunications

International telecommunication convention with six annexes. Done at Geneva December 21, 1959. Entered into force January 1, 1961.<sup>2</sup>

*Ratifications deposited:* Saudi Arabia, June 19, 1961;<sup>2</sup> Netherlands (includes Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, and Netherlands New Guinea), June 29, 1961.

Radio regulations, with appendixes, annexed to the international telecommunication convention, 1959. Done at Geneva December 21, 1959. Entered into force May 1, 1961.<sup>2</sup>

*Notifications of approval:* Argentina, June 14, 1961;<sup>2</sup> Norway, June 16, 1961.

## White Slave Traffic

Agreement for the repression of the trade in white women, as amended by the protocol of May 4, 1949 (TIAS 2332). Signed at Paris May 18, 1904. Entered into force July 18, 1905 (35 Stat. 1979).

*Assumed applicable obligations and responsibilities of the United Kingdom:* Nigeria, May 18, 1961.

<sup>2</sup> Not in force for the United States.

<sup>2</sup> With a statement.

<sup>2</sup> With reservations.

<sup>2</sup> With a statement and a reservation.

<sup>2</sup> With a statement and reservations.

<sup>2</sup> With a reservation.

<sup>2</sup> With a declaration contained in final protocol.

<sup>2</sup> With a declaration.

## BILATERAL

### Brazil

Agreement amending the agreement of January 5, 1961 (TIAS 4755), relating to the settlement of the debt arising from the agreement of August 20, 1954 (TIAS 4755), for the purchase of rare earth sodium sulphates and manganese ores. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington July 20 and August 7, 1961. Entered into force August 7, 1961.

### Cameroun

Agreement providing for the furnishing of economic, technical and related assistance. Effected by exchange of notes at Yaounde May 26, 1961. Entered into force May 26, 1961.

### China

Agricultural commodities agreement under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 455; 7 U.S.C. 1701-1709), with exchanges of notes. Signed at Taipei July 21, 1961. Entered into force July 21, 1961.

### Iceland

Agreement amending the agricultural commodities agreement of April 7, 1961 (TIAS 4723). Effected by exchange of notes at Reykjavik July 6 and 18, 1961. Entered into force July 18, 1961.

### Israel

Agreement amending the agricultural commodities agreement of November 6, 1958, as supplemented and amended (TIAS 4126 and 4188). Effected by exchange of notes at Tel Aviv June 15 and July 10, 1961. Entered into force July 12, 1961.

### Turkey

Agreement amending the agricultural commodities agreement of January 11, 1961, as amended (TIAS 4669 and 4750). Effected by exchange of notes at Ankara July 17, 1961. Entered into force July 17, 1961.

Agricultural commodities agreement under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 455; 7 U.S.C. 1701-1709), with exchange of notes. Signed at Ankara July 29, 1961. Entered into force July 29, 1961.

## DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

### Confirmations

The Senate on August 1 confirmed Edmund A. Gullion to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Congo. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 558 dated August 9.)

### Designations

Henry L. T. Koren as Director of the Office of Northeast Asian Affairs, effective July 31.

<b>American Republics.</b> Alliance for Progress, a Program for the Peoples of the Americas (Dillon, Kennedy) . . . . .	355
<b>Asia.</b> Koren designated Director, Office of North-east Asian Affairs . . . . .	386
<b>Atomic Energy</b>	
Mr. Dean Returns to Geneva; President Hopes for Success of Negotiations (Kennedy) . . . . .	376
The Vela Program, Its Importance in Detecting Nuclear Explosions and in Securing an Effective Test Ban Treaty (Dean) . . . . .	375
<b>Aviation.</b> Air Talks Open With Venezuela . . . . .	373
<b>Brazil.</b> President Quadros of Brazil To Visit United States . . . . .	360
<b>Canada.</b> U.S. Asks Approval for Construction of Certain Works in Niagara River . . . . .	369
<b>Ceylon.</b> Results of GATT Tariff Negotiations With Peru, Ceylon, Finland Announced . . . . .	373
<b>China</b>	
U.S. Postage Stamp To Commemorate Anniversary of Chinese Revolution . . . . .	372
Vice President of China Visits United States (text of joint communique) . . . . .	372
<b>Congo (Léopoldville).</b> Gullion confirmed as Ambassador . . . . .	386
<b>Congress, The</b>	
Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy . . . . .	385
Department Supports Continuation of Refugee and Migration Programs (Jones) . . . . .	380
The Vela Program, Its Importance in Detecting Nuclear Explosions and in Securing an Effective Test Ban Treaty (Dean) . . . . .	375
<b>Department and Foreign Service</b>	
Confirmations (Gullion) . . . . .	386
Designations (Koren) . . . . .	386
Officers of the Department of State Holding Presidential Commissions, With Functional Designations, December 1944-July 1961 . . . . .	370
<b>Economic Affairs</b>	
Results of GATT Tariff Negotiations With Peru, Ceylon, Finland Announced . . . . .	373
The Search for Balanced Economic and Social Development (Stevenson) . . . . .	363
U.S. Asks Approval for Construction of Certain Works in Niagara River . . . . .	369
U.S. Welcomes Prospect of Entry of Great Britain Into Common Market (Kennedy) . . . . .	362
<b>Finland.</b> Results of GATT Tariff Negotiations With Peru, Ceylon, Finland Announced . . . . .	373
<b>Germany</b>	
Secretary Holds European Talks on Current World Problems (Rusk, text of NATO communique) . . . . .	361
Travel Restrictions in Berlin Called Contravention of Agreement (Rusk) . . . . .	362
<b>International Organizations and Conferences</b>	
Alliance for Progress, a Program for the Peoples of the Americas (Dillon, Kennedy) . . . . .	355
Mr. Dean Returns to Geneva; President Hopes for Success of Negotiations (Kennedy) . . . . .	376
The Vela Program, Its Importance in Detecting Nuclear Explosions and in Securing an Effective Test Ban Treaty (Dean) . . . . .	375
<b>Mutual Security.</b> Alliance for Progress, a Program for the Peoples of the Americas (Dillon, Kennedy) . . . . .	355
<b>Nepal.</b> Letters of Credence (Koirala) . . . . .	362
<b>North Atlantic Treaty Organization.</b> Secretary Holds European Talks on Current World Problems (Rusk, text of NATO communique) . . . . .	361

<b>Peru.</b> Results of GATT Tariff Negotiations With Peru, Ceylon, Finland Announced . . . . .	373
<b>Presidential Documents</b>	
Alliance for Progress, a Program for the Peoples of the Americas . . . . .	355
Mr. Dean Returns to Geneva; President Hopes for Success of Negotiations . . . . .	376
U.S. Welcomes Prospect of Entry of Great Britain Into Common Market . . . . .	362
Vice President of China Visits United States . . . . .	372
<b>Refugees.</b> Department Supports Continuation of Refugee and Migration Programs (Jones) . . . . .	380
<b>Science.</b> The Vela Program, Its Importance in Detecting Nuclear Explosions and in Securing an Effective Test Ban Treaty (Dean) . . . . .	375
<b>Treaty Information</b>	
Air Talks Open With Venezuela . . . . .	373
Current Actions . . . . .	385
<b>United Kingdom.</b> U.S. Welcomes Prospect of Entry of Great Britain Into Common Market (Kennedy) . . . . .	362
<b>United Nations</b>	
Current U.N. Documents . . . . .	374
The Search for Balanced Economic and Social Development (Stevenson) . . . . .	363
<b>Venezuela.</b> Air Talks Open With Venezuela . . . . .	373
<b>Name Index</b>	
Chen Cheng . . . . .	372
Dean, Arthur H . . . . .	375
Dillon, Douglas . . . . .	356
Gullion, Edmund A . . . . .	386
Jones, Roger W . . . . .	380
Kennedy, President . . . . .	355, 362, 372, 376
Koirala, Matrika Prasad . . . . .	362
Koren, Henry L. T . . . . .	386
Rusk, Secretary . . . . .	361, 362
Stevenson, Adlai E . . . . .	363

### Check List of Department of State Press Releases: August 7-13

Press releases may be obtained from the Office of News, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.  
Releases appearing in this issue of the BULLETIN which were issued prior to August 7 are Nos. 534 of July 27 and 548 and 549 of August 3.

No.	Date	Subject
554	8/7	Civil aviation consultations with Venezuela.
555	8/7	Dillon: IA-ECOSOC meeting, Uruguay.
*556	8/7	U.S. participation in international conferences.
557	8/8	Construction of works in Niagara River.
*558	8/9	Gullion sworn in as Ambassador to Republic of the Congo (biographic details).
*559	8/10	Ball: death of Walter Bedell Smith.
*561	8/9	Hilsman: "Internal War: The New Communist Tactic."
†562	8/12	Note to Cuba on return of Eastern Air Lines plane.
563	8/13	Rusk: restrictions on travel between East Germany and Berlin.
564	8/11	GATT tariff negotiations with Peru, Ceylon, and Finland (rewrite).

\*Not printed.

†Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.



the  
Department  
of  
State

UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS  
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID  
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300  
(GPO)

*The BERLIN CRISIS*

The text of the radio-television report to the Nation made by President Kennedy from the White House on July 25, 1961 is contained in this 21-page pamphlet.

Publication No. 7243

15 cents

*DOCUMENTS on DISARMAMENT*  
1960

This 419-page volume, a sequel to *Documents on Disarmament, 1945-1959*, issued by the Department of State in August 1960, brings together for the use of private citizens and Government officials important documents for the year 1960 relating to negotiations on the international control of atomic energy, the reduction of armaments and armed forces, safeguards against surprise attack, the problem of nuclear weapons tests, various problems of outer space, and related questions.

Publication No. 7172

\$1.25

*Order Form*

To: Supt. of Documents  
Govt. Printing Office  
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$ \_\_\_\_\_  
(cash, check, or money  
order payable to  
Supt. of Docs.)

*Please send me copies of:*

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Berlin Crisis*  
\_\_\_\_\_ *Documents on Disarmament—1960*

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Street Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City, Zone, and State: \_\_\_\_\_





**1158**

# THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE



# Bulletin

Vol. XLV, No. 1158

September 4, 1961

**VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON TALKS WITH GERMAN  
LEADERS REGARDING BERLIN SITUATION . . 391**

**WESTERN POWERS PROTEST CLOSING OF SOVIET  
SECTOR BORDER IN BERLIN • *Texts of Exchanges of  
Notes and Declaration of Warsaw Pact Powers . . . . .* 395**

**CREATING A UNITED STATES DISARMAMENT  
AGENCY FOR WORLD PEACE AND SECURITY •  
*Statements by Secretary Rusk and John J. McCloy . . . . .* 412**

**FOREIGN POLICY ASPECTS OF COMMUNICATIONS  
SATELLITES • *Statement by Philip J. Farley . . . . .* 418**

**SCIENCE, DIPLOMACY, AND PEACE • *Remarks by Am-  
bassador Adlai E. Stevenson . . . . .* 402**

THE  
OFFICIAL  
WEEKLY RECORD  
OF  
UNITED STATES  
FOREIGN POLICY

*For index see inside back cover*